



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

A

818,293

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

JOHN B. LEEDS, Ph.D.



TX
326
.L48

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET



THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

WITH A SPECIAL INQUIRY
INTO

The Amount and Value of
Household Work



JOHN B. LEEDS, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS AND LECTURER IN
HOUSEHOLD ECONOMICS, TEMPLE UNIVERSITY
PHILADELPHIA

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of Doctor
of Philosophy, in the Faculty of
Political Science, Columbia University

PUBLISHED BY
JOHN B. LEEDS
234 WEST SCHOOL LANE
GERMANTOWN, PHILADELPHIA

—
COPYRIGHT, 1917
By JOHN B. LEEDS
—

PRINTED BY
INNES & SONS
PHILADELPHIA

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Preface	7- 8
Vita	9-10
Introduction	11-14
CHAPTER	
I. THE HOUSEWIFE AS A PRODUCER.....	15-28
II. AMOUNT OF HOUSEHOLD WORK.....	29-94
Sec. 1. Services a Factor in National Income	31-32
Sec. 2. The Household Schedule ...	33-34
Sec. 3. Type of Families Scheduled..	35-36
Sec. 4. Food—Purchase	37-38
Sec. 5. Food—Cooking	39-42
Sec. 6. Food—Serving	43-47
Sec. 7. Food—Dishwashing	48-49
Sec. 8. Clothing—Purchase	50
Sec. 9. Clothing—Making	51-52
Sec. 10. Clothing—Repairing	53
Sec. 11. Clothing—Laundry	54-55
Sec. 12. Clothing—Care of	56
Sec. 13. House—Cleaning	57-60
Sec. 14. House—Care of	61
Sec. 15. Children—Care of	62-63
Sec. 16. Children—Oversight	64
Sec. 17. Management of the House- hold	65-66
Sec. 18. Summary of Working Hours	67-71
Sec. 19. Extra Work	72
Sec. 20. Lost Time	73-74
Sec. 21. Work other than Housework	75-76
Sec. 22. The Eight-Hour Day	77-78
Sec. 23. Labor-Saving Machinery ...	79-83
Sec. 24. Skill and Pleasure in House- hold Work	84-92
Sec. 25. Education in Household Science	93-94

CHAPTER	PAGE
III. THE VALUE OF HOUSEHOLD WORK.....	95-114
Sec. 1. Theory of Value	97-103
Sec. 2. The Houseworker's Wages..	104-109
Sec. 3. Value of the Housewife's Work	110-112
IV. HOUSEHOLD WORK AS SPECIALIZED GAIN- FUL OCCUPATIONS	113-123
V. STUDENT SERVICE AT COLLEGE HALL.....	125-132
VI. BUDGETS AND BUDGET MAKING.....	133-171
Sec. 1. Analysis of Forty Budgets...	135-154
Sec. 2. The Revised Household Budget	155-169
Sec. 3. Total Family Income	170-171
VII. THE ECONOMISTS AND HOUSEHOLD PRO- DUCTIVE ACTIVITIES	173-212
Sec. 1. Xenophon	176-181
Sec. 2. Alberti	182-187
Sec. 3. Adam Smith	188-189
Sec. 4. McCulloch	190-192
Sec. 5. Carey	193
Sec. 6. John Stuart Mill	194
Sec. 7. Patten	195-196
Sec. 8. Ely	197-198
Sec. 9. Marshall	199-200
Sec. 10. Smart	201-203
Sec. 11. Devine	204
Sec. 12. Smart	205-206
Sec. 13. Veblen	207
Sec. 14. Seligman	208
Sec. 15. Fisher	209
Sec. 16. Patten	210-211
Sec. 17. Conclusion	212
Appendices	213-242
Index	243-246

PREFACE

IN bringing to a close this work which has extended over nearly ten years of scholastic preparation and research, grateful acknowledgment is due the many instructors, students and friends who have co-operated to make this work possible.

It was largely through the interest of Prof. Carl Kelsey (U. of P.) and Prof. Henry Raymond Mussey (Columbia), then of Bryn Mawr, that the author gave up a business, for a professional career.

The inspiration for the general economic philosophy underlying this work was drawn from the years of delightful and profitable study with Dr. S. N. Patten, Professor of Economics, University of Pennsylvania. At Columbia University the preparation of this work has been under the guiding hand of Dr. Edward T. Devine, Professor of Social Economics, who has contributed generously of his time, both in suggestions and in careful revision of the manuscript. Dr. Samuel McCune Lindsay has given helpful suggestions and encouragement. As an instructor and original student in this same field, Dr. Benjamin R. Andrews, of Teachers College, gave interested assistance in starting this research.

I am indebted to the classes in Household Science, Temple University (1914 and 1915), who obtained for me the budgets herein analyzed; to students of 1916 and 1917 who have made helpful criticisms; to every housewife who contributed to this work by filling out a sched-

ule, and especially to those who kept a record for one week of their household activities.

Finally, the unflagging zeal and sympathetic understanding of my assistant, Miss Ruth Kerr, now instructor in Household Science at the Baptist Institute, has lightened the burden of final revision of the manuscript.

But above all, this work would probably never have appeared had it not been for the many sacrifices of my faithful partner in the household firm.

JOHN B. LEEDS.

Temple University, Philadelphia.

June, 1917

VITA

JOHAN BACON LEEDS was born December 24, 1874, in Germantown, Philadelphia, of Orthodox Quaker parents. His father, Josiah W. Leeds, was the author of a history of the United States, used as a school textbook. His mother, Deborah C. Leeds, has for years been an active worker and speaker on temperance and prison reform.

There are five children in the family, of whom John B. Leeds is the third in age. He attended the Friends' School, in Germantown, then went to Westtown Boarding School, from which institution he received a diploma in 1892. Haverford College granted him the Bachelor of Science degree in 1895. On leaving college, Mr. Leeds started his business career in the Penn National Bank, Philadelphia, but devoted his after hours to work in the interests of civic reform in connection with the Municipal League. In pursuance of further understanding of the life of the lowly, Mr. Leeds lived for a time in one of the buildings of the College Settlement, at Seventh and Lombard Streets, and later in the home of a weaver in Kensington, near the "Lighthouse," attending labor meetings of all kinds. He was present at the first Co-operative Convention held in Lewiston, Maine, and made a thorough study of this movement, both in this country and abroad, including the merits of Co-operative Housekeeping. At the Lewiston Convention there were present a number of Socialists, whose influence led Mr. Leeds to make several years' intimate study of the Socialist movement. Meanwhile, Mr. Leeds left

the bank and went west to Olympia, Washington, where he became the proprietor and editor of the "Washington State Journal," in conjunction with Mr. Charles Cline, a former Speaker of the House of that State. This paper especially advocated Direct Legislation. Returning to Philadelphia, Mr. Leeds married Alice Cary Hay, daughter of John Baldwin Hay, formerly U. S. Consul at Jaffa. Upon their marriage Mr. and Mrs. Leeds took up their residence in Moorestown, N. J., where they lived until removing to Philadelphia a year ago, to locate near Temple University.

After a short stay with the Philadelphia Saving Fund Society, Mr. Leeds became assistant receiving teller in the Franklin National Bank. While there he studied under Professors Patten, Kelsey, Lichtenberger, Mussey and others at the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, obtaining the M. A. degree in 1910.

In the fall of 1910, Mr. Leeds entered Columbia University, continuing in residence until the spring of 1912.

Since leaving Columbia, Professor Leeds has held the chair of Social Science at Temple University, Philadelphia, lecturing on Sociology, Economics and Household Economics.

Feeling keenly the need of practical work as training for the students preparing to take up institutional work, Prof. Leeds last summer assumed the financial responsibility for "College Hall," a hotel at Ocean Grove, N. J., an account of which is given in Chapter V.

INTRODUCTION

HOUSEHOLD economics is not a separate science. It is the application of the science of economics to the activities of the household. Economics is the science which deals with man's¹ wants and with the goods upon which the gratification of his wants depends.² "Goods," as an economic term, includes commodities (things) and services.

The study of household economics deals with all those activities of the housewife, and her assistants in household work, which are concerned with the production and consumption of the commodities and services, which satisfy the wants of herself, her husband and children for food, clothing and shelter. The husband's productive activities are mostly outside of the household. Whether he is a farmer and brings food from the field or a mechanic who brings home money to purchase food, in either case most of the food cannot be consumed until further productive activities have been expended upon it. Little clothing is now made in the home, but no clothing can serve its purpose unless continually re-made for use by laundering and repairing. Shelter is more than a furnished house; it is a house heated, lighted and cleaned. Thus man's and woman's activities are essentially of the same nature. Both are spending the major portion of their efforts to obtain food, clothing and shelter, one more directly, the other often indirectly, as in the case of a factory worker who works all day long making

¹ Using man as the generic term for the human race.

² Seager, Prof. Henry R., "Principles of Economics," 1913

shoes and exchanges the money received therefrom for the necessities of life.

Apparently, however, no serious attempt has heretofore been made to apply the laws of economics to household work as they have been applied to agriculture, manufacture and mining. Just as a study of economics is now considered essential to a complete understanding of office and shop activities and the relation of employer and employee, so the same principles should be studied by the housewife who wishes to conduct her household as an efficient industrial establishment.

Many educational institutions advertise in their catalogues courses in household economics when no lectures in this science are given, but merely lessons in cooking and sewing, properly designated as Domestic Science and Art. If one speaks of lessons in cooking as Household Economics, one should refer to the making of nails as Factory Economics, or the spraying of trees as Agricultural Economics. The word economics will better be employed as covering the study of the general laws governing productive activities and their application to a given field of labor.³

The points in the present work which are new contributions in this rapidly developing field of the application of economics to household activities and problems are:

FIRST—The current idea that woman has changed from a producer to a consumer, is shown to be based upon the inaccurate assumption that spending the family income is consumption. Purchasing commodities is an act of production. Also, the exercise of choice is part of the productive process; being rated as a cost of production

³ This distinction is not made in Maria Parloa's "Home Economics" (1898). Preface: "'Home Economics,' 'domestic science,' 'domestic economy' and 'household economy' are all terms which are applied to the same science (the management of the home)."

by all retailers, it should be considered an expense of production in the household budget.

SECOND—The failure of the economic partnership of man and wife is suggested as a major cause for the break-up of many families.

THIRD—The investigation at first hand, by means of a schedule filled out by 60 housewives, of the amount of time spent in household work. This included the securing of data regarding:

A.—The different types of work carried on in the household and the time given to each kind of work.

B.—The extent to which labor-saving devices are used or the reasons for their non-use.

C.—The possibility of an eight-hour day for the housewife and her assistants.

D.—The proportion of housewives who prefer household work to any other type of productive activity, and the subdivision of household work preferred.

E.—Housewives' estimates of the money value of their productive activities.

FOURTH—Forty budgets, with the average and the most frequent expense under each heading, are tabulated and analyzed in greater detail than has heretofore been done for families of the \$1,800 to \$2,400 income groups.

FIFTH—Budget headings are carefully analyzed and re-arranged. The expense of food, clothing, shelter and advancement is thus more accurately ascertained through the elimination of the heading "Operation," and by the introduction into the budget of the consideration of the expense of the services of the housewife and her assistants.

SIXTH—A general survey of works on economics is made, indicating the extent to which economists have neglected heretofore to give adequate consideration to productive activities in the household.

CHAPTER I
THE HOUSEWIFE AS A PRODUCER

THE HOUSEWIFE AS A PRODUCER

A FAVORITE topic in recent economic writings on woman has been "Woman in Industry." Industry always refers to the work which women are doing outside of the household. But has the work in the household no economic value? If we pay two dollars a day for some one to come in and sew for us or wash or scrub, when the wife and mother does this work is it worth as much as that of the hired helper, or more or less? And the care of children, the management of the household—are these economic production as is the making of candy in a factory or the pounding of a typewriter in a down-town office? Is woman's work in the house a true trade, industry or profession.

There is a common saying that man is a producer and woman a consumer. By a producer we mean that man creates wealth. Wealth is apt to be thought of as signifying money especially. Yet, anything which is made to satisfy human wants is wealth. But wealth is more than money and valuable things, it also includes services. The economist says that production is "the creation of utilities to meet human desires."¹ A waiter brings us food in a restaurant or a car takes us to our daily business and we pay for these services as well as paying for food and clothing, therefore, they are wealth, because they supply our needs. We pay a musician for the creation of music, although it is not a tangible "thing" and fades away as quickly as produced, yet because we

¹ Seager, Principles of Economics, page 55.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

enjoy hearing music we demand it and pay liberally to have this demand or desire filled.

"There is a propriety," says Dr. Devine, "in assigning the field of production to man since the grosser forms of production, those things in fact which most have attracted the attention of economists, have been mainly carried on by the labor of man. Production on a large scale has been in his hands." "To woman has fallen the task of directing how the wealth brought into the house shall be used, whether much or little shall be made of it,³ and what kind of wealth shall be brought. In the current theories, the importance of this latter function has been absurdly underestimated."⁴

Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman says: "Speaking collectively, men produce and distribute wealth and women receive it at their hands. Women consume economic goods."⁵ Mrs. Ellen H. Richards also takes the same view that women are primarily consumers. "The home has ceased to be the glowing centre of production from which radiate all desirable goods, and has become but a pool toward which products made in other places flow—a place of *consumption*, not of *production*."⁶ Mrs. Bruère, as late as 1913, writes in "Increasing Home Efficiency," that "Modern housekeeping has let go of production and concentrated on consumption." An education in housekeeping must be almost entirely an education in consumption. "From an all-round producer the American

³ Xenophon, in the fourth century before Christ, commented upon this division of labor. See page 178, *infra*.

⁴ Devine, "Economic Function of Woman." A paper presented in November, 1894, before the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Reprinted as Teachers College Bulletin, second series, No. 3, October 8, 1910.

⁵ Gilman, "Women and Economics," page 9.

⁶ Richards, "The Cost of Living," page 23.

THE HOUSEWIFE AS A PRODUCER

woman has become the greatest consumer in the world. Of the ten billion dollars spent annually in the United States for home maintenance, food, shelter and clothing, fully 90 per cent. is spent by women. Isn't the science of consumption, then, worthy of special emphasis in the training for home efficiency?"

Dr. Scott Nearing says: "Contrasted with the self-sufficient family of the early nineteenth century the industrial family of the twentieth century is dependent largely on money income for its support." "Engaged in occupations outside of the home, the twentieth century family, instead of being a producer of its own consumption goods, has become a consumer of consumption goods produced by others." "The transference of occupations from the home to the factory converts the home into a buying rather than a producing unit."⁶ This is true of families in which husband and wife both work in the factory and procure their meals at restaurants. For most families it would be more accurate to describe them as a buying *as well as* a producing unit.

On the other hand, the view that the housewife's activities are productive is ably presented by Dr. Devine.

In his paper on "The Economic Function of Woman,"⁷ he says: "It is not true that man alone is a producer. Not only has the field of industry and of professional life been occupied and honorably so by woman, but also in the home itself, woman may be said in the strictest sense to be a producer of wealth. The work of cook and chambermaid is production. A steak is worth more broiled and placed on the table than it is in the butcher's

⁶ Nearing, "Reducing the Cost of Living," 1914. Chapter III, Section 6. The title of Section 7 is "The Family as a Buyer."

⁷ Supra, page 18. ("Supra" is used to signify a reference to a previous page in this book; "infra," to a later page.)

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

tray. We recognize that, if it is a question of paying for it in an eating-house; so should we also recognize it in our own dining-rooms. Rugs and carpets are worth more after they are swept and cleaned. We recognize that at house-cleaning time if we pay a man to carry them away for a beating, so should we also recognize it when with far greater labor they are kept bright and clean by the daily use of the broom."

This view we think economists must all eventually accept—that the woman who cooks food for her husband is doing as productive labor as is the man who hoes corn, or the chef in a large hotel who receives a high salary for adding values to raw food materials. Cleaning houses is as productive of values as is the cleaning of streets, for which latter work men are constantly employed at wages. So the washing of dishes gives back to them a value which they lost when the meal was eaten—for then they were "consumed" not only by their use, but by the fact that they became soiled and so lost some value for future use, since they could not again be used until that value was restored through the cleansing process. That the washing of clothes is productive of values hardly anyone will be disposed to question, since many housewives have already given over this work to the laundry. The direction of the household is also as truly productive as is the management of a department store or an apartment house, for it is the control of productive activities.

Yet those economists who agree that these kinds of work are productive leave outside other activities of the housewife, which are certainly not the using-up of values.

That woman is pre-eminently the consumer of goods has largely been emphasized by the above writers, not because of her activities as just enumerated, but because she is, more than man, a purchaser of commodities

THE HOUSEWIFE AS A PRODUCER

which are shortly to be consumed.⁸ A wife sits at her desk and works out menus for the day's meals. She then goes to market, selects the foods necessary for her purposes, carries them home and stores away those which are not for immediate use. Potatoes are peeled, canned goods opened and innumerable other processes gone through with in order to make the food palatable and more readily digestible. As soon as the food is served upon the table, the man and wife commence their repast. Now consumption begins. All the previous processes were acts of production—of creating commodities which are now to be consumed. Jevons says, "By a commodity we shall understand any object, substance, action or service which can afford pleasure or ward off pain."⁹ Marshall speaks of the national income as consisting of "commodities, material and immaterial, including services." Smart says: "We should replace the terms 'commodities,' 'goods,' by the term 'services.' It suggests the essential principle of industrial society as a great co-operation of mutual service. We cannot get a satisfactory conception of the national income till we recognize that, whether we pay men or women or pay for goods, what is paid for is always service."¹⁰

Now let us see what were the services of the woman mentioned above:

1. She decided what foods were required.
2. Invested time in getting them and bringing them home giving them an added "place" value—they were worth more to her in her kitchen than in the market stall.

⁸ "Women as Spenders" is the title of Chapter XX in "Woman and Social Progress." Prof. and Mrs. Nearing.

⁹ Jevons, W. S., "Theory of Political Economy," 1874, page 45.

¹⁰ Smart, Wm., "The Distribution of Income," 1899, page 31.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

3. Selected her goods—she exercised choice. This is the science of marketing; it is an act of exchange, not of consumption. When the housewife buys apples and potatoes she is no more a consumer than is the retailer when he discriminatingly buys of the wholesaler. Prof. Patten has indicated this when, in discussing whether the young wife of an unskilled laborer should herself work outside of the home, he says: "It is plainly bad economy to assign a person who has proven capacity to be a producer of world goods to the sole task of spending an income so low that no choice or saving can be made on it; it is adding another expensive middleman to production."¹¹

Exactly. The woman who buys is another expensive middleman in the process of exchange (a part of production) and an expensive one when little choice can be made, since such labor will then have a very low utility, for the possibility of exercising a *wise* choice is what gives value to this effort on the part of the woman.

3. She invested time in bringing her purchases home, giving them an added "place" value, for they are worth more to her in her kitchen than in the market stall.¹²

4. Put away the provisions not needed for immediate use.

5. Prepared the food.

6. Cooked the food.

7. Set the table.

8. Served the meal.

9. After the meal she cleared the table.

¹¹ Patten, "Independent," December 1, 1904. "Young Wives in Industry."

¹² Or the store may deliver the food purchased. Those stores, however, which have no delivery system frequently sell their goods at a lower rate on this account.

THE HOUSEWIFE AS A PRODUCER

10. Washed the dishes and put them away.

Each one of these acts was an act of production.

At another time, the family needs clothing.

1. The woman looks carefully over the wardrobe of her husband, her children and herself and makes a list of what is required.

2. She spends several hours in going down town to the shops where her purchases are made and in moving about from shop to shop, using part of this time in choosing wisely (it is to be hoped) what is needed to meet the requirements of the family.

4. She brings the goods home.¹⁸

5. She tries on the various articles, rejects those which do not fit well and puts away the accepted garments.

Each one of these acts was an act of production. Consumption does not begin until the garments are put on and worn. This is conclusively shown in that some of the purchased goods may be returned as unsatisfactory; they certainly could not have been consumed, therefore, when they were purchased.

So "shopping" is, after all, production and at times a very expensive element in production. Frequently it is a serious question whether bargain hunting pays. A woman sees a great "bargain" in the papers—\$5 hats reduced to \$3.98. She drops her household duties and goes for the hat. The actual cost, in a given case, might be \$3.98 plus three hours time at 30 cents an hour, plus ten cents carfare, a total of \$4.98. Had she bought the hat when getting other things the proportionate cost of

¹⁸ The "products" in this case are both the satisfaction of having the goods at once and the addition of place value which is usually not a saving of expense to the purchaser because in most cases purchases of clothing are delivered and the average expense therefor added to the price of each article.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

time and carfare would be, say, about one-fourth of a dollar, making the actual cost \$5.25. While at times there are real advantages in purchasing specially-priced goods, yet the "saving" to the individual bargain-hunter is often mythical, based on the fallacy that a woman's time "isn't worth much anyhow." That under our present system of household industry this is too often true may be as much the fault of the system as it is that of the individual housewife.

That the sale of articles to housewives is part of the productive process is thus stated by Prof. Clark: "An article is not finished, in the economic sense, till the retail merchant has found the customer whose need it satisfies. The sale of the completed articles is thus the terminal act of social production." But we must carry this act a little farther and add that the terminal act must include the delivery of the article to the home of the purchaser either by the seller or by the buyer.

The principal point which differentiates this theory of consumption from the viewpoint of previous writers on economics is the statement that the choosing of goods is part of the productive, rather than of the consumptive, activities of men and women. To make this clear, let us suppose that, instead of considering a housewife who orders a list of provisions which may be delivered to her an hour later, we are dealing with a frontiersman's home: Spring has come. Husband and wife discuss the food wants of the family for the coming year. The man then chooses the required seeds, plows the ground, plants the seed, cultivates the soil and gathers the harvest, or, the wife goes each day into the garden and gathers the vegetables required. The choosing of the seed and the choosing of which part of the product shall be served upon the table each day are both productive activities,

THE HOUSEWIFE AS A PRODUCER

one at the beginning, and the other toward the close, of the process, the latter being not even *at* the end, but *toward* the end, usually. For if purchase is consumption, then after food is thus consumed, how can another productive activity, cooking, be expended upon it?

So we finally come to a consideration of the statement that consumption determines production. As Fetter has expressed it: "The buyer eventually dictates the direction of industry. Therefore, choosing vines or violets, pictures or pretzels, each with his nickel helps to determine what shall be produced."¹⁴ Dr. Devine says: "Choice logically precedes production. If an article is no longer chosen by consumers it is no longer produced. The direction of wealth consumption does not devolve entirely upon woman, but it does very largely. It is the present duty of the economist to magnify the office of the wealth expender. Even if man remain the chief producer and woman remain the chief factor in determining how wealth shall be used, the economic position of woman will not be considered by those who judge with discrimination as inferior to that of man. For if it falls to man chiefly to direct the general course of production, consumption is the field which belongs pre-eminently to woman."¹⁵

Choice does not precede production; *it is a part of production*. Taking the country over a man eats as much as a woman, wears as much as a woman (except in conspicuous consumption¹⁶) and requires the shelter of a house as much as a woman (her use of the house during

¹⁴ Fetter, "Principles of Economics," page 392.

¹⁵ Devine, "Economic Function of Woman," pages 9, 10, 14, 15.

¹⁶ Veblen, "Theory of the Leisure Class," Chapter IV, "Conspicuous Consumption." Conspicuous consumption refers to the wearing of clothing, not for health and comfort, but to show the high earning power of the wearer or of her husband.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

the day as the scene of her productive labors is not "consuming" the house merely, but a "productive utilization" of it also). Men and women are equally consumers of wealth produced by their joint efforts. If the efforts of women are not rewarded by adding as large values to the national wealth as do those of men, it may be the fault of the system, quite as much as, or more than, that of the women. The work of men has largely become specialized by the division of labor; to make that of women most effective, it also must be increasingly specialized; cooking is as much a profession for a specialist as is laundry work or tailoring.

We utterly disagree, therefore, with the view that, "Although not producers of wealth, women serve in the final processes of preparation and distribution. Their labor in the household has a genuine economic value. For a certain percentage of persons to serve other persons, in order that the others so served may produce more, is a contribution not to be overlooked. The labor of women in the house, certainly, enables men to produce more wealth than they otherwise could; and in this way women are economic factors in society."¹⁸

This idea of vicarious production—that what women are doing is not really of economic value, except as it increases the opportunities of the real doers of deeds to do them—is partly, if not largely, responsible for the continuance of the belief that the work of housewives and houseworkers is not of as great worth as is that of men.

¹⁸ Seager, "Principles of Economics." The use of goods, such as coal in a factory, as a part of the productive process. Also called "productive consumption."

¹⁹ Gilman, C. P., "Women and Economics," page 13.

THE HOUSEWIFE AS A PRODUCER

It is to be hoped that after a careful examination of this subject, economists will increasingly realize that the activities of a housewife are essentially productive. To what extent she produces wealth and what is the value of her productive efforts will be the subjects of succeeding chapters.

CHAPTER II

AMOUNT OF HOUSEHOLD WORK

SECTION I

SERVICES A FACTOR IN NATIONAL INCOME

HAVING arrived at the conclusion that household work is productive of wealth, in that services are rendered which fill wants of men and women, the next step will be to consider the amount of this addition to the national income.

That "national income is a better measure of general economic prosperity than national wealth," is the view of the distinguished English economist, Prof. Marshall.¹ He says: "The labor and capital of the country, acting on its natural resources, produce annually, a certain net aggregate of commodities, material and immaterial, including services of all kinds." "It is a continuous stream always flowing, and not a reservoir or store or fund."²

Smart says: "If we speak, then, of the national income as a sum of services, embodied in material forms or not embodied, we seem to get an expression equally applicable whether we conceive of it as a sum of goods which minister to the wants and activities of man's life or calculate it as a *sum of services*."³

The services of workers who toil in mill, mine and factory, or on the farm, and of capitalists, are valued either in the total amount of wages, rent, interest and profits paid for their services, or in the market value of

¹ Marshall, "Principles of Economics," 1898 Ed., page 151.

² Marshall, page 594.

³ Smart, "Distribution of Income," 1899 Ed., page 33.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

the total commodities produced. Probably the total income represents more nearly the addition to wealth during the year, since many services, such as those of lawyers, doctors, teachers and houseworkers, do not embody themselves directly in commodities.

The situation is thus clearly stated by Prof. Smart: "This national income, represented and paid by the money income, does not exhaust the wealth that accrues periodically to the nation. In the modern State the unpaid services attain great dimensions. The greatest unpaid service of all is that of women in the household. What this income really amounts to may be guessed if we imagine what we should have to pay to servants for doing work now done by the wives, sisters and daughters, and how entirely impossible it would be to get similar work done for money. [?] If such women went to the factory or into professional life, we should have to withdraw probably a much greater number from the factory or professions to take their place, and should lose something with it all."⁴

While we thus find a recognition of the fact that there is a large amount of wealth produced by services rendered in the household, no serious attempt has heretofore been made to obtain information regarding the amount of this work. It might be approximately calculated if the United States Census would include in its questions the query to all women not engaged in what has heretofore been recognized as "gainful occupations," "How many hours on the average each day of the year are you engaged in household work?"

⁴ Smart, "Distribution of Income," 1899 Ed., pages 68-70.

SECTION II

THE HOUSEHOLD SCHEDULE

IN order to ascertain just what are the activities within the household which have an economic value as productive work, and the attitude of housewives toward these activities, a household schedule of forty-one questions (Appendix A) was prepared and several hundred were sent out by mail. Although these were sent to persons who there was reason to believe were interested in household economics, a very small percentage were returned filled out. Most of the eighty replies to the schedules were obtained by personal interviews or through students who interviewed parents or friends. Of the eighty, fifteen were so defective as to make their use undesirable. Five were from families living in apartment houses and were not used. Of the remaining sixty the answers are based upon "estimates" of the housewife,⁵ except in the case of twelve who also kept an actual record of the amount of housework done as explained in Section 41 of the schedule.

While at first thought one would be likely to say that actual records are of much greater value than estimates,

⁵ The function of a wife is to be the mother of children and the companion of her husband. Nevertheless, after marriage it is generally assumed that the wife will do the housework, in which case she becomes the housewife. She may be wife without being housewife, but she is not housewife without being wife, in name at least. If she bears no children and all love and companionship have ceased then she tends to become a household drudge, although it is possible for her to enjoy household work and yet rebel at the conditions on which her product is sold. (See page 102, et seq.)

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

a careful study of both shows that some of the latter are more nearly accurate as a basis for calculating an average year's work than are some of the former. If the housekeeper happened to be preserving or doing spring cleaning, or had the dressmaker, or an unusual amount of company during the week scheduled, or even was a little overcareful about her work so as to make a "good showing"—in any of these or many other ways such a week would not be an average one. The best records are those in which a housewife has kept a record of her working hours for an average week, multiplied this by fifty-two, and then made allowance for special work done at certain times of the year, such as canning and dressmaking.

SECTION III

TYPES OF FAMILIES SCHEDULED

MOST studies heretofore made in this field have been of abnormal conditions (the submerged, dependent groups), or the so-called working class. The attempt was made in this case to have schedules filled out by families beginning with those earning enough for "decency"^a and including what Prof. Patten calls the one-servant class. All of the families studied were of American birth. The aim was to select families having children, preferably under ten years of age (non wage-earners).

Twenty-six of the families scheduled had children under ten years of age; thirteen had one, four had two and nine had three such children. Half of these twenty-six families had older children also. There were thirty families in which all the children were over ten years of age; eight of them had only one child; five had two; ten had three; six had four; one had eight.

Counting the children of all ages the size of the families was as follows:

No. of Children per Family	No. of Families
0	4
1	11
2	9
3	19
4	11
5	2
6	3
8	1
	<hr/> 60

^a See page 135, *infra*.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

The average is $2\frac{3}{4}$ children per family. The families having three children are the most numerous.

The annual budget asked for in Query 27 included only food, clothing, shelter and operation, and did not include "personal" expenses. These partial budgets run from \$700 to \$3,750. The average budget is \$1,575; the median, \$1,425. The most frequent is \$1,300, that being the budget of six families.

Sixteen housewives have husbands engaged in a "professional occupation"; thirteen were married to "business men"; ten to "skilled laborers"; seven to "clerical workers"; seven reported no husband; four gave no information; three reported "farmers" as the breadwinner.

Nearly all the families reside in the State of Pennsylvania; ten in Philadelphia, ten in some other city, twenty-three in towns, six in suburbs, six in villages and five in the country.

Eighteen housewives report that they spent their youth in a city, nine in a town, four in suburbs, six in a village and twenty-two in the country. It is interesting to note that while over a quarter of the housewives were raised in the country only a twelfth of them reside there now.

The information given in the schedules was obtained during the years 1912-1914. The most important original material secured was embodied in the answers to Section 15 of the schedule, in which housewives were asked to state the number of hours' work done by all members of the household in each line of household work during an average week; in addition information was sought regarding the skill and pleasure of housewives and houseworkers in their varied activities. (See Appendix A.)

SECTION IV

FOOD—PURCHASE

THE average time spent in buying food, as recorded in these schedules, was about four hours a week. It varied from one-half hour to eleven hours per week. The most frequent time recorded was two hours, which was given in sixteen schedules; three in fourteen, and four in fourteen; less frequent were five hours in five schedules, six in seven and seven in six. (Item A, p. 67.) Two hours would be twenty minutes daily for six days; three hours would be thirty minutes; four hours, forty minutes.

Food purchase in this inquiry includes time spent in the planning of meals, deciding what to buy, telephoning orders, interviewing salesmen from stores, marketing, checking off purchases when they arrive and putting goods away.

If a housewife's time were of no, or very little, value, then the popular view would be correct and marketing might well be a daily vocation of women. It is because time values are so generally ignored or underestimated that much foolish advice is given along this line. On the average probably five minutes' use of the telephone will accomplish as much as a half hour spent in visiting the store, with a saving of twenty-five minutes' time over against an occasional bargain missed. Where the housewife firmly insists on the return of all goods delivered which are not of the grade represented or desired, she soon finds that she can buy without leaving her home to very nearly as good advantage as by marketing.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

A few years ago the editor of a widely-read woman's magazine,⁷ in a leading editorial, asked reproachfully if the American housewife knows whether or not the food she buys is pure, and if she knows whether or not she is getting full measure. One is forced to the conclusion that such a writer never made up a daily schedule of housework, not to mention trying to live up to it. That editor believes it to be the duty of a woman to bear and raise children, and he probably is aware of the fact that a servant is a luxury to be enjoyed by the few only. The average woman ought not to be expected to stop her housework to give a chemical test of the food she purchases daily nor even stop to weigh each package. A considerable amount of time would be saved and better results would be obtained if there were efficient, trained food inspectors for every thousand housewives (about 300 for the city of Philadelphia). We might, however, wisely charge off against food purchase an occasional hour spent in agitation for proper food inspection.

⁷ *Ladies' Home Journal*, October, 1913.

SECTION V

FOOD—COOKING

THE time recorded for the preparation and cooking of food is fourteen hours for twelve families; twenty for six; twenty-one for seven; twenty-two for five; twenty-four for eight, and each hour from eight to thirty-one (except above mentioned) is given by one or two families as the time required. One family allows forty-five hours, which is large for a private family, except where two houseworkers are employed. Twenty-one hours is the average time weekly; the most frequent allowance of time is fourteen hours weekly. (Item B, p. 67.)

Query 11 asks: "Do you cook with wood, coal, gas, oil, alcohol or electricity?" The replies are: Coal and gas, twenty-one; gas, eighteen; coal and wood, nine; coal, six; coal and oil, two; gas and electricity, one; gas, electricity, coal and alcohol, one; gas and oil, one; wood and oil, one. The next part of the query refers to an economic activity: "If you use coal or wood, who carries the fuel from cellar to kitchen stove?" The replies are: Husband in fifteen families; husband and housewife, one; husband and son, one; husband and houseworker, one; housewife, four; housewife and daughter, two; daughter, one; son, ten; houseworker, four; hired man, one.

Whether time for this work was included by housewives in making up their schedules cannot definitely be stated. Its importance as productive labor lies not so

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

much, however, in the number of minutes consumed daily as in the strain such labor often gives to an overburdened or weak worker. This, with the care of the furnace, is one of the "costs"⁸ of housework which some housewives and husbands are glad to have eliminated by the use of gas for cooking, and a central heating plant.

The time required for cooking will vary greatly with the nature of the meals served; therefore Query 19 asks housewives to give an average day's menu. The answers are interesting, but not sufficiently accurate to be of value. Many did not mention soup or salads, and a few omitted dessert; forty families served eggs or meat for breakfast, so the cereal and fruit breakfast, popular with dietitians, satisfied only the minority in this group. Coffee and tea are mentioned three times as often as milk. One vegetarian family of two made a careful record and found that for the week recorded only eight hours was spent in cooking, an average of fifteen minutes for breakfast, twenty for lunch and thirty-five for dinner.

Baking adds appreciably to the time required for cooking, so Query 20 asks: "Do you make bread? Rolls? Cake? Pie?" Twenty-three families make bread, five of them making all they use, while thirty-seven families make no bread. Twenty-eight families make rolls. Home-made cake is customary in fifty-three families. Fifty prefer home-made pies. Thus while bakers or grocerymen have captured 60 per cent. of the bread-making in this group and nearly half of the families purchase rolls, pie and cake are still produced by most of the housewives or by their assistants.

⁸ "Costs," as distinguished from "expenses," of production are the efforts and sacrifices of producers, whereas "expenses" refer to what is paid for articles when purchased. Seager, "Principles of Economics," page 58.

FOOD—COOKING

Butter-making is practically a lost art to the city housewife. Only six schedules report butter-making; these are from country homes, except one from a city-bred woman who makes butter "not because it is cheaper, but I like it better."

Preserving is not yet a lost art for the majority of housewives. It is a work which is seasonal in nature and therefore likely to be overlooked in making up a record of housework unless a special request for information be made. For this reason Query 20 asks: "Do you put up fruits and vegetables? If so, specify amount annually of jams, jellies, preserves, canned fruits and vegetables, grape juice, etc." Only three families stated that they did no preserving at all; one put up only grape juice. In order to reduce the amount to a common denominator, four jelly glasses, or two pickle bottles, are reckoned as holding one quart. Twenty-seven families each canned between thirty-five and 100 quarts; sixteen recorded from 100 to 200 quarts; one family reported only six quarts, while the product of one family's labor totaled 290 quarts. These forty-five families canned an average of forty-nine quarts of fruits. Only thirty-two families report canning vegetables, with an average of twenty-one quarts per family. Forty-five families made an average of sixteen quarts of jellies and jams. Twenty-one families averaged eleven quarts of preserves. Twenty-six families averaged eight quarts of beverages in the form of grape-juice, raspberry vinegar, or blackberry wine. Only thirteen families put up pickles and catsups; these average eleven quarts per family. One mention only of elderberry wine and one of brandied cherries would seem to indicate that the term "brewster" does not apply to the modern American housewife as it

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

did a hundred years ago to her English or Colonial ancestor.

The time required for this work was not recorded, but even a casual observer is aware of the difference in time required to put up a quart of plums, where the fruit is simply washed and put into the jars to be sterilized, and apple sauce, which requires many hours for paring the fruit or putting it through a colander. Probably part of this time is taken from the housewife's leisure hours and part is gotten by leaving some of the dusting, or other household labors, undone.

SECTION VI

FOOD—SERVING

SERVING is the work performed by a waitress. It includes setting the table, placing food upon the table and clearing the table after the meal; it may or may not include passing food to those seated at the table during the mealtime. The time allowed for serving is as follows:

Hours per Week	No. of Families
5	5
6	4
7	7
8	5
9	6
10	11
11	4
14	6

There were a few families reporting various lengths of time up to thirty hours.

The time spent in serving meals will depend upon the quickness of the worker, the number of foods served, whether food is served in courses or all is placed upon the table at once, and upon the size of the family. To reduce all these factors to exact terms would require a special study. Taking the figures as given in the schedules we find that nine hours a week is approximately the average time. The most frequent is ten hours. (Item C, p. 67.)

An important factor in the efficient preparing and serving of food is the arrangement of the kitchen and dining-room and their equipment so as to facilitate carrying on

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

these operations without unnecessary steps. Query 8 asks: "How many steps from stove to sink? From stove to work-table in kitchen? From stove to dining-room table?" The replies are:

No. of Steps	NO. OF FAMILIES		
	Stove to Sink	Work Table to Sink	Stove to Dining Table
1	7	6	0
2	10	13	0
3	16*	13*	0
4	11	13	1
5	4	8	1
6	2	3	7
7	1	1	3
8	3	2	8
9	1	0	7
10			11
11			3
12			12*
13			1
14			2
Average no. steps	3.5	3.5	10

and in the last column one family each allows 16, 17, 20 and 24 steps.

The most frequent number of steps mentioned in each column is 3, 3 and 12 (starred in above table), which is not far from the average.

From the above tabulation it appears that nearly all the families had a fairly compact arrangement. That both time and energy are needlessly wasted by lack of compactness in culinary arrangements is the opinion of those modern housebuilders who are making small kitchens in large homes, especially since the all-gas kitchen (heated from the furnace) has eliminated the heat-radiating coal range which made a larger room desirable.*

* Frederick, Mrs. Christine, "The New Housekeeping." See diagram facing page 52 for suggested arrangement of kitchen equipment.

FOOD—SERVING

As stated above, serving may or may not include waiting on table. Query 21 of the Household Schedule asks: "When food is served, is it placed upon the table and passed around by those at the table, or is it passed by a waitress? Which method do you prefer, and why?" Of those who answered, fifty-one families pass food at the table; four have food passed by a waitress; one has a daughter act as waitress; one answers "both"; one housewife dishes food from the pots on the stove directly upon the individual plates. No waitress is preferred by thirty-nine families; reasons mentioned are: "only way when there is no waitress"; "saves expense"; "more privacy"; "too much formality when one has waitress"; "saves time"; "saves labor"; "easier for housekeeper when she has no helper"; "greater freedom"; "when family are alone together they understand each other better"; "the one opportunity family has together"; "do not eat so fast if talk while eating"; "relieves girl of extra work"; "teaches children to help with serving"; "more intimate and homelike"; "do not have to wait so long to be served"; "habit."

A waitress is preferred by fifteen families, who give as reasons: "more orderly"; "less work for those at table"; "saves crowding of dishes on table"; "keeps food hot"; "induces deliberate and careful eating to have waitress"; "better form to have waitress"; "good training for children to have waitress"; "dislike sight of all food on table at once"; "saving of labor"; (this, of course, means a saving of the housewife's time; there is no actual saving but an increase of labor).

In some families there is great irregularity regarding the time of eating meals, breakfast particularly, and therefore an increase in serving time. One family reports that at breakfast-time each person serves himself or her-

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

self from the stove at whatever time is convenient. Query 22 asks: "About how much time is lost each week by those preparing and serving meals through the irregularity of any members of the household in being late at meals?" None, was the answer of nineteen families; little, four; one-half hour, three; three-quarters hour, one; one hour, six; one and one-half hours, two; two hours, six; three hours, two; four hours, five; five hours, four; seven hours, one; ten hours, one; a great deal, one. Thirty-one families who reported time lost give a total of eighty-one hours per week, or an average of about two and one-half hours per family. The most frequent time is one hour and two hours, mentioned by six families each.

One more factor must be considered regarding the serving of meals, and that is the addition of time due to the entertainment of guests. Query 24 asks: "How much company do you entertain at meals on the average each week? Is extra assistance usually secured on such occasions? If so, how much?" The answers are given in such a manner that it is usually impossible to tell whether, when "four persons" is given it means four persons at one time or two on two occasions or one four times, yet it would make considerable difference in estimating the time required in serving meals. Several housekeepers state that the maximum of entertaining for the minimum of extra work is to have four guests at one time. Preparations for four require not much more effort than for two, but if six are invited, the houseworker is likely to ask for an extra assistant.

An average of one person weekly is reported as being entertained by thirteen families; two persons by fourteen; three, by thirteen; four, by five; five, by three; six, by three; ten, by two.

FOOD—SERVING

Forty-eight families report that no extra help is secured to assist in preparing meals for company, four of them stating that "the family help." Twelve secure extra help, seven of them only "sometimes" for "parties."

SECTION VII

FOOD—DISHWASHING

THE time required for washing dishes, pots and pans and clearing up the kitchen, varies from three to twenty-one hours, with one family recording twenty-eight hours. (This family has two young women assisting the housewife.) Seven hours is the time recorded by seven families; eight, by five; nine, by seven; ten, by nine; eleven, by five; twelve, by six; fourteen, by six; a few give more or less time. Ten hours is about the average, and also the most frequent. (Item D, p. 67.)

Many housewives continue the custom of wiping all dishes and food utensils after they are washed. Wiping the glassware and cutlery is, of course, desirable, but if the dishes are thoroughly washed in very hot soapy water, rinsed in clear hot water and placed upon a rack, they will quickly dry and look quite well. Moreover, wiping dishes, instead of being credited as productive labor because it gives increased sanitary values through greater cleanliness, really has the opposite effect. A plate which has been soiled by use at table has not as much value as one which is clean, because it is useless and therefore practically valueless as it is. By washing, it is again made of value, and thus it is continually losing and acquiring value. Its highest value is just after it emerges from the water, as then it is most sanitary. The more a dish is handled and smeared over with a cloth, the less sanitary it becomes. This is proved by the fact that if the top of a preserve jar, after it has been removed

FOOD—DISHWASHING

from the hot water in which it is sterilized, is touched on the inside, the fruit in that jar is likely to spoil.

A saving of time and expense for laundering is made by housewives who substitute doilies for a tablecloth, except for formal dinners.

SECTION VIII

CLOTHING—PURCHASE

THE answers in Section XV of the Schedule, to questions regarding clothing, show that eight families record no time as being given to the purchase of clothing. This is due to an oversight, for even though ready-made garments are not purchased, the materials would have to be bought. A half-hour each week is the average given by four families; one hour, by ten; two, by twelve; two and one-half, by four; three, by nine; four, by eight; five, five and one-half, eight, ten and twelve by one family each. Two and a half hours is the average time, and two hours the most frequent. (Item E, p. 67.)

Much time idled away in so-called "shopping," if considered in the light of diversion is no more wasteful of one's leisure time than is card-playing or gossiping, but if considered from the standpoint of using up time needed for productive work, must be regarded as an extravagance which many who indulge in this custom can ill afford.

SECTION IX

CLOTHING—MAKING

FIFTEEN (one-quarter) of the families make no clothing in the home. Two hours weekly is given up to this occupation by seven families; three, by eight; from four up to twelve hours by two to three families each, and one family each spends fourteen, fifteen, eighteen, nineteen, twenty-four and thirty hours. The last record is by the family having two assistants. The average time expended is five and three-fourths hours weekly; two to three hours is the time most frequently mentioned. (Item F, p. 67.)

Query 25 asks whether clothing is bought ready-made, made to order outside of the house, made at home by a seamstress, or made at home by members of the family including the houseworker. Fifty of the families buy all or most of their clothing ready-made; all buy more than half ready-made; none make all at home; eleven make none at home by members of the family. That the making of clothing at home is still customary, is evidenced by the fact that over one-half of the families record that they make more than "a few" garments at home.

The garments mentioned as being made at home most frequently are dresses, shirtwaists, petticoats, skirts, hats and nightrobes. No longer does mother sit with her knitting-needles and knit stockings as grandmother did, for not a single family reports home-made stockings. Ties, handkerchiefs and underwear are made by only a

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

few families.¹⁰ Only a dozen families report having a seamstress come to the house to make clothing, and when engaged her work is mostly to make dresses and skirts. The clothing made to order is usually women's hats and men's suits, while half a dozen women have tailor-made dresses.

¹⁰ Since the outbreak of the war in August, 1914, there has been an interesting reversion to the ways of our grandmothers!

SECTION X

CLOTHING—REPAIRING

The time allowed for the repairing of clothing is as follows:

Hours per Week	No. of Families
0	3
$\frac{1}{2}$	2
1	4
$1\frac{1}{2}$	4
2	12
3	10
4	5
5	3
6	5
7	5

One or two families allow eight, ten, eleven, fourteen, fifteen, sixteen and eighteen hours. Two and three hours is the more usual time estimated, while four hours is about the average. (Item G, p. 67.) Three families allow no time for mending clothes. This may be an oversight in filling out the schedule, or all the mending may be sent out to be done.

SECTION XI

CLOTHING—LAUNDRY

FIVE families send all clothing to a laundry to be washed, while nine send none. One-half of the families employ a laundress; sixteen families employ her for one day a week, eight for half a day, and seven have clothing taken to the home of the laundress.

The schedules show that two hours weekly is expended in washing by seven families; three hours, by fifteen; four, by thirteen; five hours, by eleven; six hours, by four; a few allow one, seven, eight and nine hours. One family records twelve hours for a family of seven, two young women doing the work. From three to five hours is the most frequent time allowed for this work; four and one-fourth hours is the average. (Item H, p. 67.)

The time required for ironing is usually, but not always, more than for washing. Six families who did no washing at home did ironing, which may be accounted for by the fact that often families have clothing sent home rough-dried from the laundry and ironed by the housewife or her assistant. The time recorded is two hours by five families; three, by nine; four, by ten; five, by eleven; six, by twelve; eight, by six; ten, by four; one or two families allow seven, nine, and up. The family reporting twelve hours for washing has twenty hours of ironing done by its two young helpers. Six hours is the average and the most frequent allowance. (Item I, p. 67.) In those cases in which all clothes are ironed, there is generally allowed twice as long for ironing as

CLOTHING—LAUNDRY

for washing. Many families, however, report the same number of hours for washing and for ironing, which may indicate that many of the plain pieces are folded down and pressed without being ironed. Some housewives feel that there is a great amount of unnecessary ironing being done. The argument in this case is not so strong as is that regarding washing dishes. So long as people like to see smooth garments, towels and bed linen, and are willing to pay for this satisfaction, the work necessary to produce this result has economic value equal to that of any other productive activity. As, however, people learn to simplify their work in order that more hours for rest and recreation may be secured by the housewife, then will they begin to attach less value to some desires which they now have and find new desires awakening and growing stronger as their horizon widens.

SECTION XII

CLOTHING—CARE OF

THE care of clothing includes its cleaning, pressing, sorting and putting away. If there are active young folks in a family, this is a considerable item. The schedules report for this line of work half an hour weekly for eleven families; three-fourths of an hour for three; one hour for twenty-three; one and one-half hours for three; two hours for seven; three hours for six; and one family each report three and one-half, four, five, six, seven and ten hours. The average is two hours and the most frequent time is one hour. (Item J, p. 67.)

SECTION XIII

HOUSE—CLEANING

IN considering the high cost of living in recent years, few writers have emphasized the great increase in the cost of sanitation. As the work of woman in the manufacture of clothing and the making of foods (such as butter) has decreased, while the income of the husband has increased due to the great industrial inventions and discoveries, there has come over the working class a vast change for the better. That the mass of the people and their homes were ill-smelling and reeking with filth is attested by every writer on local conditions in the old countries within even a hundred years.¹¹ Many people do not sufficiently realize the extent to which the great increase in cleanliness of home and person has contributed toward the growth of democracy. So long as the upper classes felt the necessity of using smelling-salts whenever approached by one of the common people, just so long would they despise the vile-smelling yokels.

¹¹ Kingsley, Chas., "Yeast," page 181. Tregarva, the game keeper, speaking to Lancelot: "There's many a boy . . . comes home, night after night, too tired to eat their suppers, and tumble, fasting, to bed . . . at eight o'clock . . . in the same foul shirt which they've been working in all day, never changing their rag of calico from week's end to week's end, or washing the skin that's under it, once in seven years" for they know "they must turn up again at five o'clock the next morning, to get a breakfast of bread, and, perhaps, a dab of the squire's dripping." Page 70: "How can a man be a man in those crowded styes, sleeping and packed together like Irish pigs in a steamer, never out of the fear of want, never knowing any higher amusement than the beer-shop?" See also pages 160 and 256 of the same work.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

Cleanliness is not only next to Godliness, but it is an essential to the establishment of the Brotherhood of Man.

All of those writers who so continually emphasize the fact that the woman has become a consumer rather than a producer, because so much of her work has been taken over by the factory, fail entirely to realize that the careful, conscientious housewife of today has a large amount of *new* work to take the place of that which has vanished; for now she must labor many hours in order to keep the house clean, and the clothes fresh and sweet. Since the masses of the people now want this cleanliness, the work necessary to fill this want is just as truly production as was the making of butter or candles. Instead of woman having changed from a producer to a consumer, she has, to a marked degree, changed from a producer of things to a producer of services. There has been also an increase rather than a decrease in the total amount of wealth produced by husband and wife together.

Since the amount of time spent in house-cleaning will depend quite a little upon the number of rooms in the house and upon how the floors are covered, information was requested regarding these points. (Query 7.) Of the families studied, thirteen lived in houses having eight rooms, five had nine-room houses, fourteen had ten rooms, seven had eleven, four had twelve; several lived in houses having as many as thirteen rooms; on the other hand, a few had only six-room houses. This study, therefore, deals mainly with the houses having eight to ten rooms.

Query 10 asks how many rooms have carpets, how many matting and how many have rugs?

Thirty-two of the families scheduled report using no matting; twenty-four use no carpets, while all but six

HOUSE—CLEANING

use some rugs. One uses only matting, one only carpet, and ten use rugs only. The total number of rooms reported as having the floors covered with matting is 71; carpet, 105; rugs, 332.

Query 10 also asks: "If carpets and matting are used, state how frequently they are taken up and cleaned, how cleaned, and by whom?" One reports cleaning carpets and matting once a month; one, three times a year; eighteen, twice a year; ten, once a year; one, once in two years; and two, once in three years. One family says floor coverings are not taken up since a vacuum cleaner has been purchased. Two report that matting is taken up only when worn, to be turned.

Cleaning of carpets and matting is done by the housewife in five families, by housewife and helper in one, by husband in three, by husband and boys in three, by boys in one, by hired man in thirteen, by hired woman in two, by special carpet cleaners in four, and outside of the home by five families. The practice with rugs is about the same, except that the cleanings are more frequent.

The Query "Are carpets and rugs ever cleaned by machinery outside of home?" is answered in the affirmative by twenty-four and negatively by thirty-one; one says "rarely."

Vacuum cleaners are owned by twenty-nine families, thirty have none, one has a vacuum sweeper. Of the thirty who do not own a vacuum cleaner, eighteen rent one; three once a year, five semi-annually, one three times a year, three quarterly, two monthly, one weekly, and three "occasionally." Over 80 per cent. of the families use a vacuum cleaner owned or rented.

The vacuum cleaner is used by a hired person in seven families, by housewife in ten, housewife and hired person

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

in three, houseworker in three, housewife and daughter in one, husband in one, and "family" in one household.

The time recorded in the schedules for daily housecleaning was one hour per week in sixteen families; two hours in five; three in fifteen; four in five; five in three; six in seven; several families each allow seven, nine, ten, twelve, fourteen and eighteen hours. The average is four and one-half hours weekly; the most frequent, one and three hours. The twelve families who kept an actual record allow from one to six hours weekly. (Item K, p. 67.)

Naturally, more time is allowed for the weekly cleaning, the records being as follows:

Hours per Week	No. of Families
0	3
1	0
2	4
3	9
4	9
5	9
6	12
7	3
8	5
9	5

The families keeping a record usually allow four to twelve hours; six hours is the average and also the most frequently mentioned. (Item L, p. 67.)

SECTION XIV

HOUSE—CARE OF

THE care of the house refers to chamberwork and "setting to rights," distinguished from cleaning in order that the cost of cleanliness¹² may be ascertained separately. The average time mentioned for the care of the house is one and three-fourths hours; the most frequent is one hour, which is the time given by one-third of the families; eleven record a half-hour, which is the lowest time given. One family each mention four, five, six, seven and ten hours. (Item M, p. 67.)

This division of housework also includes the care of the heating, so Query 6 asks: "How is dwelling heated? Who takes care of heating?" The replies are: Hot-air furnace, thirty families; hot water, twelve; steam, nine; coal stoves, eight; oil, gas stove and fireplace, one. More important for an economic study are the answers as to who looks after the heating apparatus: the husband does this work in thirty families; husband and housewife, five; husband and son, five; husband and houseworker, one; housewife, five; housewife and houseworker, one; hired man or janitor, five. No question was specifically asked as to the time required for this work, so it will be considered as included in the estimates of care of house.

¹² Richards, E. H., "Cost of Cleanliness."

SECTION XV

CHILDREN—CARE OF

THE inquiry regarding children (Section XV of the Schedule) was divided into three classes,—the care of their person (dressing, bathing, etc.); teaching and entertainment; oversight.

It has been stated in the description of the families scheduled (p. 20) that twenty-six of the families had children under ten years of age (thirty-three had children under twelve years of age). The time given to the care of children, and to their teaching and management, were almost the same, with slightly more time given to the former. Each hour from two up to seven per week was given by four or five families to care and to entertainment; then one or two families for each hour up to fifteen; then one family each giving eighteen, twenty-two, twenty-five, twenty-eight and thirty-three hours to care, and one each giving twenty-one, thirty-two and forty-five hours to entertainment.

The relation between large families and the time given to children is not as close as would be expected. Only one of the seven families having three children under twelve years of age gives over ten hours per week to both care of the children and their teaching and entertainment. Three give over ten hours to care, and three give over ten hours to entertainment.

Six hours per week given to the care of children and the same time to their teaching and entertainment, is

CHILDREN—CARE OF

about the average; five hours is the most frequent, although two, three, four, six and seven hours are mentioned nearly as frequently. (Items N, P, p. 67.)

SECTION XVI

CHILDREN—OVERSIGHT

THE answers to the query regarding the time given to the oversight of children are indefinite, owing, no doubt, to the vague understanding of what was to be included under this heading. One mother answered "all the time," which is true to the extent that potentially she may be called on at any minute and that the responsibility for her offspring, when they are under school age, is never off her mind. A footnote in the Schedule (Section XV) explains that "oversight of children while doing other things, as eating meals, shopping while out walking with them, etc., should count just what additional time is required above that necessary if there were no children."

Each hour from one to ten is credited by from one to three families as the time given to oversight, and one family each mentions fifteen, seventeen and nineteen hours. These latter families each have a young child, but no baby; a family having a baby credits no time to oversight, although giving twenty-one hours for the care of the infant. The average time given to oversight is about seven hours weekly; six hours is mentioned most frequently. The difficulties of accurate measurement of the time properly coming under this heading is apparent. (Item O, p. 67.)

SECTION XVII

MANAGEMENT OF THE HOUSEHOLD

MANAGEMENT of the household includes the time spent on the keeping of accounts, planning of work, and, when it is being done by others, its oversight. Like the oversight of children, management is a very necessary work which is difficult to determine accurately in terms of hours. Yet there is no other duty of the housewife which, if successfully performed, will have so great an effect upon the comfort and value of home life. No matter how excellent a cook a woman may be, or how clever with her needle, if this one supreme quality is lacking she cannot be considered a successful housewife. Yet she may be an adorable wife!

No time is reported under this heading by fifteen families; some of these housewives stated that plans were being revolved in the mind and worked out while they were doing the dishwashing, making the beds, etc. One hour is allowed for management by eight families; one and one-half hours by six; two hours by thirteen; three hours by twelve; four hours by five; six hours by four; one family each allows five, seven, twelve, fifteen and eighteen hours; the average is about three hours weekly; three hours is also mentioned most frequently. (Item Q, p. 67.)

As the settlement of accounts is a necessary part of household management, Query 28 asks: "Who usually

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

pays the monthly bills?" In twenty-six families the husband pays the monthly bills; in twenty-two the housewife pays them; in three either husband or wife makes a settlement; four families report that they pay cash.

SECTION XVIII

SUMMARY OF WORKING HOURS

THE results obtained from the sixty families scheduled, under each of the above seventeen divisions of housework, may now be tabulated. The hours given represent the total amount of work of the housewife and her assistants, whether hired or members of the family.

Item	Average	HOURS PER WEEK		
		Most Frequent	Lowest	Highest
A. Food, purchase	4	2	0½	11
B. Food, cooking	21	14	8	45
C. Food, serving	9	10	5	30
D. Food, dishwashing	10	10	3	21
E. Clothing, purchase	2½	2	0½	12
F. Clothing, making	5¾	2 & 3	0	30
G. Clothing, repairing	4	2 & 3	0	18
H. Clothing, laundry, washing.	4¼	3 & 5	0	9
I. Clothing, laundry, ironing...	6	6	2	20
J. Clothing, care of	2	1	0½	10
K. House, cleaning, daily.....	4½	1 & 3	1	18
L. House, cleaning, weekly....	5	6	0	9
M. House, care of	1¾	1	0½	10
N. Children, care of	6	5	2	33
O. Children, oversight	7	6	1	19
P. Children, entertainment	6	5	2	45
Q. Management	3	3	1	18
	<hr/> 101¾	<hr/> 82		

Query 3 asks the housewife to state how many hours are daily spent on week-days and Sundays in housework, by herself and by each member of the household. The detailed summary of the replies is as follows:

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

Hours per Day	Housewife No. of Families		All Workers No. of Families	
	Weekdays	Sundays	Weekdays	Sundays
1	0	3	0	1
2	0	5	0	0
3	2	7	0	3
4	5	14*	0	5
5	2	8	0	7*
6	5	6	1	5
7	4	3	1	5
8	6	6	3	4
9	5	0	1	2
10	14*	2	2	4
11	2	0	3	2
12	7	1	8*	3
13	2	0	3	1
14	1	0	4	2
15			3	2
16			3	2
17			3	0
18			4	1
19			2	1
20			4	0
21			3	0
Average	8½	4.8	15	8.4

The average for the housewife is eight and one-half hours per day, while the most frequent time given is ten hours; for Sunday the average is 4.8 hours and the most frequent time four hours. This would give a 56-hour week for the average and a 64-hour week as the most frequent. Eight hours per day would be fifty-six hours weekly, and nine hours would be sixty-three. The difference between this and the working hours of men is that nearly all men have Sunday off, and many of them have a half-holiday on Saturday. Ten hours for five days and five hours for Saturday would be fifty-five hours, or nearly the equivalent of the average for the housewife. Twelve hours for five days and six hours for Saturday would be sixty-six hours, which is little more than the time mentioned most frequently by housewives.

* Those starred are most frequently mentioned.

SUMMARY OF WORKING HOURS

The estimated time daily spent in housework for all the members of the household is fifteen hours on weekdays as the average, with twelve hours the most frequently mentioned; on Sundays 8.4 and five hours respectively. This gives a total of almost 100 (98.4) hours of work per week as the average time expended in household work.

These estimates must now be compared with the answers given under Query 15. Here the housewife is asked to "state the number of hours' work done by each member of the household in each line of household work during an average week." When these estimates are totaled and averaged (p. 67), the result is a little over 100 ($101\frac{3}{4}$) hours per week, or a difference of only three and one-half hours from the average under Query 3. Yet many of the individual estimates under Queries 3 and 15 vary widely, thirty-eight out of sixty being ten or more hours different in amount. Thirty housewives give a larger estimate of working hours under Query 3 than under Query 15, while twenty-five housewives estimate the opposite way.

Numerous discrepancies in individual household schedules were due to carelessness, such as those cases in which the work of a daughter or maid is included under Query 3 and not under Query 15, or vice versa. Some of the widest discrepancies in the number of hours per week were:

Query 3	222	142	90	77	151	86
Query 15	58	80	40	46	76	200

If a housewife were paid by the hour as shown by a time slip handed in at the end of the week (as are many working men), such discrepancies would be unlikely to occur. They show the indifference of a considerable

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

number of housewives to studies of household conditions made for the purpose of improving such conditions. This is characteristic, of course, of a certain percentage of all workers. Some uncomplainingly accept whatever Providence may have seen fit to ordain as their lot; others complain of overwork, not realizing that usually more use of the head would save much use of the hands and feet.

In the next table a comparison is made between the actual weekly records of housework kept by the families as suggested in Section 41 of the Schedule and "estimates" for the same families given in answer to Query 3:

Estimates	28	55	76	126	66	80	97	134	104	133
Actual record	28	46	54	63	65	80	89	112	120	128

The next to the last schedule given in this table was made by a graduate student in household science who a year before had filled out a schedule for the same family, recording sixty-seven hours under Query 3 and two hundred and twenty-three hours for Query 15. The revised schedule shows the benefit of education, in that greater care was used in making records. The family reporting only twenty-eight hours of housework will seem to most housewives to have made a wild guess, but this is an actual record made by a bright young woman who is keenly interested in labor-saving methods. The hours given to cleaning are few, because her house has all hard-wood floors covered with rugs; dishes are washed only once daily (immediately after breakfast) and not wiped. The family is vegetarian, eats no pies or cakes, and rarely fries food, hence there are few greasy pots and pans to clean. There are no children, and the housewife does

SUMMARY OF WORKING HOURS

all the work, except for the assistance of a laundress one day bi-weekly. This young housewife feels that she has solved the housekeeping problem, but as there are no children, the family is not a "normal" one.

SECTION XIX

EXTRA WORK

ALL of the housewife's time is not accounted for when the regular duties of the day have been recorded and classified. Even with the best of management there is a multitude of duties which cannot be avoided; odds and ends of work which do not fit into any of the classes mentioned. Extra time when a special dessert is desired, or a guest comes, answering the doorbell, a bad tear in the boy's trousers requiring immediate attention, getting the little folks ready for a party, illness of husband or children, furniture repairs, and so forth. Whether the time required for these duties should be taken out of that allowed for some other item, such as reducing the time given to cleaning, when company comes or illness occurs, or whether the housewife lengthens her working time, will require further investigation to determine definitely. Organized workers usually expect extra pay for "overtime"!

SECTION XX

LOST TIME

AS allowance must be made for extra time, so some consideration must be given to time that is lost in running a household. Amongst working men much time is lost each year through accident, illness and unemployment. One advantage of choosing housework as a career is that there is not much suffering or loss of time from accidents, most of those which occur being slight bruises, burns and cuts. But illness affects the housewife in a double measure, both in preventing her from working and in taking her time as nurse to look after other members of the family who become ill. While the housewife does not suffer from unemployment, since she is never out of a "job," she may, if there are no children, have far more leisure time than has her husband.

In the table, under Query 3, there is a column in which the housewife is asked to make a record of "Health," "measured by physical ability to do household work eight hours a day." Forty-nine recorded their health as being "good," ten as "fair," and one, "poor." The purpose of the query was to ascertain to what extent the work of the housewife is curtailed by physical weakness, but the data are not sufficient to yield any conclusions of value. The question should have been worded, "How many days during the past year were lost through illness?" Investigations are just beginning to be made along this line amongst working men as the result of industrial insurance laws which are giving us data as to the number of hours per man per year lost by sickness. In the case

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

of women working in the home we should consider not only the actual days lost when one is confined to a bed with extreme illness, but the great loss through poor health when the worker barely manages to keep on her feet and but does only a half or a third of a good day's work.

Writers on household topics who lay great emphasis upon those forms of woman's work which have been taken out of the home and specialized, as the making of clothing, butter and candles, do not often refer to another branch of work which has, also, to a considerable degree, been given over to specialists. The doctor, the hospital and the trained nurse have relieved the overburdened housewife of a considerable portion of the nursing of the sick which has been one of her various vocations. Even today, however, the mother is expected to be able to handle all mild attacks and to call upon these aids only in cases of severe illness. No accurate information on this point has yet been obtained.

SECTION XXI

HOMEWORK OTHER THAN HOUSEWORK

IN addition to those duties recognized as household work many housewives are expected, or choose, to perform other labors either for the purpose of saving money or of sharing their husband's burdens. In the country, for instance, there are farmers who consider the care of chickens as part of the housewife's duties, and sometimes the milking of cows or the keeping of the dairy is also added. Only a few of the families investigated lived in the country and none of them, apparently, included such labors as the above in their answers to Queries 3 and 15. In the present inquiry such work is not considered as housework.

In country, suburban and many city homes the care of the lawn and flower garden occupies quite a number of hours weekly of the time of the housewife or husband or gardener. This work might fairly be included under housework inasmuch as its object is to increase the beauty of the home, yet since no query was made regarding it no attempt will be made to estimate the amount of time spent in this way. A few of those who made exact records for a week made mention of care of flowers or work outside of the house, but this was not included in the final total of housework.

Query 12 asks: "Do you or any of your regular household do any papering, painting, whitewashing, make carpentry repairs or any other work in house not usually classed as household work? If so, how much

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

time was spent in each such line of work in the past year?"

One-half of the families report that some work of this character has been done, but it is impossible to make an accurate estimate of the amount thereof, because no one had kept a record of the time thus spent.

Carpentry work is mentioned by fourteen families as having been carried on during the year for from one day to a month; painting by ten families (one mentions screens and porch furniture); whitewashing, six families; papering, three families; varnishing, two; staining floors, one; upholstering, one; plumbing, one. Time under this heading will be considered as extra work (p. 42).

Query 13 asks: "Is any work done in the home other than household work and that included in answer to Query 12?" Very few answer in the affirmative. One does arts and crafts work; two do dressmaking (for others than their own families); several refer to care of chickens, garden or lawn.

SECTION XXII

THE EIGHT-HOUR DAY

AS the complaint is occasionally made by the housewife that "woman's work is never done," an attempt was made to ascertain the views of housewives by asking (Query 16): "If physical ability and skill of housewife and present assistants were first class could all your household work be done, as you would like to see it done, during present working hours?" "Could it be done if housewife and present assistants worked on an eight-hour day basis?"

To the first question only five housewives answered "No," one adding "No, emphatically"; to the latter question eleven answered "No," one other "sometimes," another says, "Yes, if there was some incentive" (referring to her two young women assistants). One housewife who has no children remarks, "Do not need eight hours."

One might hazard the suggestion that *if* people would be satisfied to eat simply prepared, wholesome food and to dress neatly, avoiding the vagaries of "style," a normal family could operate on an eight-hour day basis with the assistance of one houseworker. Or, since Sunday work is unavoidable in the private household, eight hours for five days, six hours on Saturday and four hours on Sunday would give fifty hours for each, or one hundred hours per week for both housewife and houseworker, which is about the time estimated as required by the average of the sixty families under study. (See p. 69.)

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

Two interesting queries arise here:

Should the American business man expect from his wife or her assistant longer hours of labor than he asks of his office force?

When the American working man will expect of his wife only as many hours of labor as he asks of his employer will there not be a revolution in housework?¹²

¹²At the Convention of the American Federation of Labor held in Philadelphia, November, 1914, a resolution favoring a six-hour day was passed. Suppose the wives of the delegates should strike for this work day in the household!

SECTION XXIII

LABOR-SAVING MACHINERY

THE amount of time required in housework is affected to a considerable degree by the tools with which the work is done, in other words, by the extent to which labor-saving devices are used. In fact, many writers are urging that the introduction of a multitude of labor-saving machines into the kitchen will furnish the solution of the problem of the overworked housewife.

Query 14 asks: "How many labor-saving devices do you make regular use of in your housework? State reason why you do not use the article mentioned."

The one machine used by all of the sixty families is the sewing machine. It would seem almost as strange to calculate the time saved by the use of a sewing machine as it would to credit the saving made by the use of a stove rather than an open fireplace for cooking, so accustomed have most of us become to the presence and use of this great labor-saving device. Possibly a generation hence our children will feel the same way regarding some of the implements with which we are just now commencing to experiment. But although we accept the time saved by the use of the sewing machine without comment, nevertheless we should reckon on the added value of an hour's work by its use when we come to consider the value of an hour's working time.

A machine almost universally owned is a carpet-sweeper, which fifty-six families state that they use. Four do not have sweepers, three of them because they

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

have rugs, which they prefer taking outside to clean, and one on account of expense. One remarks, "Do not use it as housekeeper thinks it does not clean well enough."

One-half of the families own vacuum cleaners, twenty-two of which are operated by hand and seven by electric power; one has a vacuum sweeper. Of the thirty who do not own one of these machines, two expect to purchase one soon, and two have none "because there is no electricity in the house and the hand machines are too hard to work."¹⁴

Even though the thorough cleaning of a room with a vacuum cleaner may take as much time as sweeping the room, a saving of time will result from the fact that the room will be much cleaner and it will need to be cleaned less frequently. By the use of the vacuum cleaner there will be a saving in the time spent on dusting. Furthermore, the old method of sweeping with a broom which fills the air with dust is inimical to the health of the sweeper.

In the washing of clothing the use of a wringer and washboard was assumed. That there is a considerable saving of time and wear and tear on clothing by the use of these over the primitive method of beating clothes with a paddle or pounding them with a rock and wringing them out by hand is evident. No data were obtained regarding the number of families whose homes are equipped with stationary wash tubs; their use saves some time at each week's washing.

Washing machines are reported by half of the families; nineteen use hand machines and four have power ma-

¹⁴ Some rural housewives are beginning to utilize the automobile motor to operate an electric vacuum cleaner and other mechanical aids to the housewife.

LABOR-SAVING MACHINERY

chines; the remainder do not state which form is used. The reasons given for not using a washing machine are varied: Seven state, "Have none because washing is done out"; two mention "expense"; one family each gives as a reason for non-use, "we have a washing machine but laundress prefers not to use it"; "washer-woman would not use it"; "prefer washboard"; "prefer hand washing, less wear on clothes"; "does not get clothes clean" (those who use machines find that it is necessary to give stains and spots a special hand treatment); "not necessary"; "ignorance." A "cold mangle," a machine about twice the size of a wringer, was reported by one family. The clothes are taken from the line when all but dry, folded and put through the mangle, then laid away ready for use.

To the inquiry as to whether the family is using a power attachment (electric or water) for sewing machine, washing machine, wringer, mangle, etc., forty-four answer in the negative; thirteen, "on account of expense"; two, "have no use for it"; two, "do not care to bother to experiment"; one family each gives as a reason for non-use of power,— "not enough work to require it"; "never tried them"; "not yet"; "ignorance"; "have no power in the house"; one country housewife pointedly remarks, "husband has power at the barn, but wife is not considered." One family uses water, and one electric, power for a sewing machine; one has an electric attachment for a washing machine. Therefore, only three out of sixty housewives make any use of other than hand power in housekeeping, except in connection with vacuum cleaning, and in that line of work only seven used electric machines, a total of ten using power applied to housework.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

One-half of the families use no gas or electric iron; thirteen use gas; eleven, electric; three have both; four answer simply "yes," without specifying which. One reports a gasoline iron. Seven have neither because there is no gas or electricity in the house; three, "have not bothered to experiment with it"; two say "gas iron too heavy and no electricity in the house"; each of the following reasons is given by one family,—“electricity too expensive”; “expect to purchase electric soon”; “gas is cheaper than gas iron, use only one jet for two irons”; “washerwoman does not like to use it”; “not desirable for our work”; “prejudice.”

The dishwasher is not in use in any family. The reasons for non-use in the order of frequency given were: seven, “expense”; six, “no use for it” or “not needed”; three, “do not think it will work”; two, “family small”; two, “ignorance”; two, “never saw one”; and one each,—“never tried one”; “never thought of it”; “do not like it”; “prefer handwashed”; “prejudice”; “destroys china”; “do not care to experiment”; “too expensive for number of dishes used”; “dishwashing good training for girls”; “inefficiency of cook.”

Whether a bread mixer is a desirable labor-saving device depends, of course, first upon whether the family prefers to make bread at home. The answers to Query 20 showed that only twenty-three families make bread at home; of these sixteen use a mixer. Two families report a cake mixer. The reasons given for not using a machine are: By three families, “not desirable”; by one family each, “expense”; “family small”; “prejudice”; “ignorance”; “never tried it”; “expect to purchase one”; “helper does not care to try it”; “never thought I should like it”; “family consumes little bread and then a beaten whole wheat mixture”; “prefer hand-made bread.”

LABOR-SAVING MACHINERY

Egg beaters, meat grinders, potato ricers and similar utensils were not scheduled as they were assumed to be in all kitchens of the class of homes being studied. In preserving fruit the use of a cherry stoner is advocated by some housewives; others claim that the work can be done as quickly by hand, and still others do not like the machine because it mangles the fruit.

The fireless cooker is one of the kitchen utensils which is now receiving much attention, yet only six families report having this valuable implement. The reasons given for not having a fireless cooker are: Ten families give as the principal difficulty, "expense"; ten, "not needed"; four, "do not care to experiment"; four, "will purchase one soon"; one family each states,—“prefer gas stove”; “have such a good gasoline range”; “keep coal fire all the time for hot water”; “never tried it”; “would use it if did not have hired help”; “rather prejudiced against it.”

The saving made by the use of a fireless cooker is not so much in actual hours gained for other work as it is a saving in gas used, in watching and worrying for fear food will burn and in added tastiness of many foods prepared by this method. For these reasons its use should add to the value of the housewife's time.

SECTION XXIV

SKILL AND PLEASURE IN HOUSEHOLD WORK

HAVING considered in some detail the time spent in the various branches of household work, we must consider two other factors: the skill with which the work is performed and the pleasure experienced while doing it. The former could be satisfactorily ascertained only by first establishing definite standards and then testing each housewife thereby. As a matter, therefore, of interest rather than exact value we submit the replies to Section 15, wherein, after the hours of work have been estimated, the housewife is asked to record her skill and pleasure in doing each line of work. Since the answers are in each case the opinion of the housewife regarding her own skill they do not have the value which would attach to the consensus of opinion of several friends or even of the rest of the family.

SKILL AND PLEASURE IN HOUSEHOLD WORK

	SKILL					PLEASURE				
	E.	G.	F.	P.	V.	K.	P.	I.	D.	S.
Food—Purchasing	25	13	1	1	0	11	21	6	2	1
Cooking	21	15	0	1		11	22	4	2	0
Serving	10	21	3			8	11	14	3	0
Washing dishes	15	14	2			2	5	12	6	7
Clothing—Purchasing ..	18	16	3			13	18	6	0	0
Making	14	12	6			13	16	3	1	0
Repairing	17	15	3			5	11	15	7	0
Washing	9	10	2			3	6	11	4	1
Ironing	12	9	2			2	10	10	3	2
Care of	19	12	2			4	15	13	2	0
House—Cleaning, daily.	21	16	1			5	22	11	0	1
Cleaning, weekly ...	20	15	0			4	18	11	1	1
Care of	18	13	0			4	20	9	0	0
Children—Care of	15	8	2			11	11	3	0	0
Oversight of	10	8	1			7	10	1	0	0
Entertaining	11	12	1	1		9	15	1	0	0
Management	17	10	4			11	17	2	3	0
	272	219	33	3		123	248	132	34	13

E. = excellent; G. = good; F. = fair; P. = poor; V. = very poor; K. = keen enjoyment; P. = pleasure; I. = indifference; D. = dislike; S. = strong dislike.

The numbers under each heading, as "purchasing food," etc., should add up to 60, but not all the housewives recorded their skill or pleasure.

The first point to note is the large total of housewives judging themselves "excellent" in housekeeping skill compared with less than half as many points recorded under "keen enjoyment." This may indicate that many housewives are working from a sense of duty rather than with joy in their work, and it is possible that a housewife's pride in the performance of her duty has colored her judgment regarding her skill.

Taking up the detailed classification we find that as regards food purchase, out of forty housekeepers, twenty-five think that they are "excellent" in this line of work, half as many rate themselves as "good," while only one admits being "fair" and one, "poor."

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

Yet should not an "excellent" purchaser of food be equal in skill to a professional? What else would A-1 signify? We will take one of the housewives who recorded herself as an excellent purchaser of food and rate her according to her ability as ascertained by a careful analysis of the elements involved in food purchase. In making such an estimate it is quite as important that we consider not only the *ability* of the housewife but her *customary practise*.

SKILL AND PLEASURE IN HOUSEHOLD WORK

SKILL IN PURCHASE OF FOOD

	Value in Points	Rating of House- wife
1. Knowledge of food values required for children, for adults; for headworkers, for muscleworkers; for healthy, for sick; for winter, for summer	25	5
2. Knowledge of food values in given foods to enable one to buy the largest total of protein, starches, carbohydrates and mineral salts, ¹⁸ for amount of money expended	25	3
3. Knowledge and practise of buying when foods can be secured most reasonably; seasonal buying	6	5
4. Buying in such quantities as to secure lowest rate	5	3
5. Careful planning so that staple goods are always on hand and meals are not delayed waiting for late orders to arrive..	5	1
6. Purchase in such a way as to give most pleasing variety to members of family, consistent with above principles	5	4
7. Buying according to budget; displaying knowledge of how much the family can afford to spend on food, keeping within this allowance yet not stinting more than necessary	6	6
8. Checking off goods received and careful inspection of them to see that they are up to standard paid for, including weighing and measuring, when desirable, and reporting short weight to proper authorities	5	4
9. Reasonable knowledge of food adulterations and how to detect them; reporting to proper authorities all suspicious articles	10	5
10. Buying expeditiously, using phone or taking trip to market or whatever method experience proves to bring a maximum result for a minimum of time	8	7
	<hr/> 100	<hr/> 43

¹⁸ For great importance of the mineral salts see the excellent work by Dr. Sherman, "Chemistry of Food and Nutrition," Chapter X, "Inorganic Foodstuffs and the Mineral Metabolism," 1913.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

This analysis shows that the housewife who considered herself A-1 as a purchaser of food, by the above rating should be recorded as only "fair."

Returning to the analysis of the table on page 85 we find twenty-one excellent cooks and fifteen good ones, with none rating themselves as fair and only one poor. This may indicate the housewife's pride in her profession more nearly than it would her actual ability in this line if tested by a standard such as the following:

SKILL IN COOKING		Value in Points	Rating of House- wife
1. Planning menus adapted to the needs and preferences of individual members of the family as regards food value, variety and wholesomeness		12	8
2. Use of left-overs		4	2
3. Preparation of food:			
1. Economical	4	4	
2. Properly combining ingredients.....	4	3	
3. Accuracy in measurements	4	2	
4. Variety in methods	2	1	
5. Seasoning and flavoring	4	4	
6. Garnishing	2	1	
	— 20	—	15
4. Knowledge of heat required for foods to be cooked in order to have:			
1. Flavor preserved.			
2. Food-value retained.			
3. Wholesomeness	20	16	
5. Ability to economically obtain or use required heat from range (including building a fire if coal or wood is used)...	6	5	
6. Having food always at right temperature..	4	3	
7. Routing work:			
1. Knowledge of time required to prepare and cook food.			
2. Punctuality.			
3. Saving steps.			
4. Working so as to use fewest possible utensils	10	7	

SKILL AND PLEASURE IN HOUSEHOLD WORK

8. Care of utensils	4	4
9. Sanitary handling of food	8	7
10. Speed	8	3
11. Ease with which housewife works	4	3
	<hr/> 100	<hr/> 73

The table on page 85 indicates that twice as many housewives rated themselves excellent in cooking as there were those who acknowledged keen enjoyment in the work, and whereas only one woman rated her skill as a cook below that of "good," six were indifferent to or disliked the work. Half as many housewives rate themselves excellent in serving as in cooking while the pleasure is about the same in both these activities. Note that strong dislike is mentioned more frequently for dishwashing than for all other lines of work combined; enjoyment and pleasure are the least frequently mentioned. Yet no housewife admits being poor in skillfully handling this work.

In the case of clothing the skill in purchasing, making and repairing are all rated about equally, with slightly more skill claimed in repairing than in making. The enjoyment in repairing clothing is markedly less frequent than in making, while the dislike is greater than for any work except dishwashing. The records show, also, much skill but little pleasure in the care of clothing. Skill is about equally divided between excellent and good in washing and ironing, as it is likewise between pleasure and indifference, while keen enjoyment is almost lacking. Any housekeeping arrangement, therefore, which will banish the dishwashing, mending basket and "blue Monday" would seem to clear the housewife's horizon of most of the clouds.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

In the care and cleaning of the house there are only two housewives who admit that they dislike this work or are not good at it.

More mothers believe themselves excellent in the care of children than in teaching and entertaining them. It is noteworthy to find also that more record themselves as having pleasure rather than keen enjoyment in their relations with their offspring. Only three, however, admit indifference in this regard.

In "management" seventeen housewives claim to be excellent, ten good and four fair, while on the other hand the eleven having keen enjoyment in this work are exceeded by the seventeen who have only pleasure, two are indifferent, three admit dislike.

Here again, as in the case of cooking, family pride and inability to see ourselves as others see us, coupled with a lack of definite standards, might lead a housewife to overestimate her abilities. If we judge the manager of a home by the same standards with which we judge the manager of a business those recorded A-1 might dwindle surprisingly and even many of the good be rated fair, while the poor column might not be omitted.

Finally, the total points in each column are of interest. Excellence in doing housework, as noted above, is claimed more than twice as frequently as is keen enjoyment, whereas there are forty-seven points credited to dislike and strong dislike and only three to poor skill. No housewife rates her ability in any line of housework as very poor.

This brings us to the point raised in Query 36, "Do you feel that you get a satisfaction out of household work because you are doing it for your family, which you would not feel if you were doing the same work pro-

SKILL AND PLEASURE IN HOUSEHOLD WORK

professionally for a salary?" To this every housewife replied "yes," except one who "can hardly say," and one other who says "yes," but adds, "Yet at the end woman has nothing for herself, no money—nothing but just the 'glory' of bearing children and scrubbing and being an unpaid 'slave!'"

To ascertain whether housewives look upon their work as a duty to be performed rather than as a joyful occupation, Query 34 asks, "If you had a choice would you prefer household work to any other profession and why?" One-third (twenty families) answered "no." Two say that housework is hard and confining; others remark that "it is too monotonous"; "it is too hard work for no pay"; "it is necessary to know so many things and it cannot be neglected ever"; "I was not educated for the work"; "I hate it thoroughly."

Those who choose housework give as reasons: "Love of home"; "it is truly woman's work and I enjoy it more than anything else"; "suitable to a woman"; "because I am happy"; "because of the children"; "variety is pleasing and it makes the home"; "like home, dislike to go out to work"; "as a mother, yes; as a wage earner, no"; "because I know most about it"; "because I know a little about it and would like to know more."

Asked, under Query 35, which line of household work would be chosen if they were to specialize, the housewives replied: Cooking food, eighteen; management, nine; purchasing food, three; serving, four; house cleaning, three; care of children, three; sewing, two; "laundering," one; ironing, one.

Those housewives who in answer to Query 34 stated that they did not prefer housework, were asked, "What

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

lines of work would you prefer?"¹⁸ Replies were: Seven, teachers; three, music; three, dressmaking; two, matron of institution; one, library work; three, gardening; one, arts and crafts; one, clerical work; two, architecture; two, professional work; two, social worker; two, literary work; one, law; one, medicine.

The next question is, "Have you done or are you doing any work for which you received or are receiving a salary?" Only one claimed to be engaged in other work than housework at present and that woman is running a farm since the death of her husband. Ten had been engaged in a gainful occupation before marriage; five, teaching; two, dressmaking; one, settlement work; one, business, and one, factory inspection.

¹⁸ Frederick, Christine, "The New Housekeeping." "Multitudes of women have an attitude of mere tolerance toward housework—preferring business or other careers, looking impatiently and contemptuously on all housework, hoping to be relieved of it entirely some day, and exchange it for something 'more interesting.'"

SECTION XXV

EDUCATION IN HOUSEHOLD SCIENCE

FIFTY-TWO of the sixty housewives reporting have not taken courses of training in household work in any school, nor have had private paid lessons. (Query 37.) Eight, however, reply: "Short courses during winter months"; "learned by studying magazines and by asking authorities"; "taught at home by mother"; "read magazines and daily papers"; "yes, Boston, three years"; "various schools, including studies in Vienna"; "one year in cooking school"; "short courses but mainly *years* of experience."

It, therefore, appears that only five out of sixty housewives have had schooling in household science. The general inclusion of this subject in the school curriculum is now rapidly taking the place of instruction by parents or the learning by costly experience after starting house-keeping. There is an increasing tendency to favor teaching this science less from the book in sample doses and more by practical work in preparing real meals in connection with school lunch rooms and college dormitories. Still better is the plan for young women on graduating from grammar school to work their way through high school by working part time at their chosen profession and part time in book study, thus relieving their parents of an unnecessary financial burden and improving, usually, the sturdy character of the young women. This

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

can be done in household science courses quite as readily as in commercial courses.¹⁷

Fifty housewives are not members of any club or association which devotes at least part of its time to household affairs. (Query 39.) Only two reported that they are members of the American Home Economics Association, the national organization which specially studies household problems. Only two housewives subscribe to the *Journal of Home Economics*, the official publication of the above organization.¹⁸

A list of twenty standard publications of interest to housewives was given under Query 38 with a request that a mark be placed under each one read. The authors most widely read, outside of cook books, were: Richards, Gilman, Mason and Salmon.

¹⁷ The William Penn High School, Philadelphia, has arranged with a department store to carry out a plan of part work in the store on salary and part study in salesmanship courses.

¹⁸ 1211 Cathedral Street, Baltimore, Md.

CHAPTER III

THE VALUE OF HOUSEHOLD WORK

SECTION I

THEORY OF VALUE

IN the previous chapter we have discussed the amount of household work. Its value is quite as intricate a problem. In an excellent statement of "The Value of Woman's Work," the writer says:¹ "It is obvious that to speculate on the value of woman's work in terms of wages is idle, for she is not living under the wages system. The work of running a household involves the practice of a number of skilled trades, requires the use of much unskilled labor and demands some administrative power. To rate this combination of trades and effort with its undetermined labor-time would be an appalling task. But it is a task we need not undertake, for the work of the housekeeper who is also the wife is not exchangeable and, therefore, can have no real money value."

With this view we cannot concur. It is a common saying that a mother's value is "inestimable"; it is objected by others that to attempt to value the services of a wife is undesirable because the sacred relations between husband and wife would be lowered if they were reduced to a financial basis. Those who take this position fail to distinguish between a woman as wife and as housewife. One readily differentiates the work done by a man as farmer from his services as a father and husband. Just because he steps out of the house to

¹ Maud Thompson in "International Socialist Review," December, 1909.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

work is no reason why a money value should be given to his work and no such recognition be given to his wife's labors. But the point is made by Miss Thompson that woman's work cannot be rated in terms of "real money value" because its products are not "exchangeable." This test, however, does not cover all services for which wages are paid. A gardener is paid real money for his day's work, yet the product of his work in cutting grass, sweeping walks and driveways does not come into the market. A woman is paid money wages for a day's work in cleaning a house, yet the product of that labor is not exchangeable. If the labor of a houseworker is paid for in real money there is no reason why, when a housewife discharges her assistant, and takes her place, her own efforts should not be considered as having a money value.² Several theories regarding the valuation of the housewife's work have been suggested.

Is not the value of a housewife's labors measured by the living which she is getting? In many cases the income of male workers is not paid in money but "in kind," in whole or in part. A farmhand is paid a certain sum in cash wages and also receives his board and lodging. Sometimes work is done on shares and the income is one-half of the product. The wages a man receives is his money income; what he can buy in food, clothing and shelter with his wages is his real income. The latter will vary widely in different parts of the country.³ If the husband and wife, when they marry, enter into an economic partnership to share and share

² The economist Senior expresses the same view.

³ Hence a difficulty pointed out by Prof. Streightoff. If we add together the wages paid in New York, Philadelphia, Atlanta and other cities in various parts of the country, we can get a total of money income, but a mere jumble as regards the real income of the working class.

THEORY OF VALUE

alike,⁴ then the wife will get an equal amount of food, clothing, shelter and spending money with her husband, therefore, her real income will be the same as his. Now, if the husband buys one-half of his wife's products with one-half of his income that determines the money value of her income. To say that household work has no real money value because the products of the work of the housewife are not exchangeable⁵ overlooks the actual fact that these products do come into a market and are exchangeable, but under monopoly conditions.⁶ The housewife sells one-half of her products to her husband.

If the husband receives an income of \$2,400 and pays his wife one-half of it for her services, then the other half of her services must be worth as much more. The *family budget* will, therefore, stand thus:

<i>Receipts</i>		<i>Expenditures</i>	
Husband's income	\$2,400	Husband pays wife	\$1,200
Wife, cash from husband	1,200	Husband expends on budget	1,200
Wife, value of other half of her services..	1,200	Wife expends cash received	1,200
	<u>\$4,800</u>	Wife contributes in services	1,200
			<u>\$4,800</u>

While the *household budget* is:

<i>Receipts</i>		<i>Expenditures</i>	
Cash from husband	\$1,200	Food	\$720
Cash from wife	1,200	Clothing	360
Services valued at	2,400	Shelter	480
	<u>\$4,800</u>	Operation	480
		Salary to housewife ...	2,400
		Advancement, sundries and savings	360
			<u>\$4,800</u>

⁴ An interesting catch question is this: If a woman's efforts are worth as much as a man's, and a housewife works as many hours as her husband, if he pays her the full value of her labor, what has he left for himself?

⁵ See page 101, *infra*.

⁶ See page 102, *infra*.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

The fallacy in this argument is two-fold. First, the wife takes the food provided by the husband, adds her labors to the product of his, and then both equally share the combined product. If her efforts add as much value as he contributed then the family income is doubled, but if her efforts add only one-half as much value as his, then the husband has a real income of only three-quarters what he would have enjoyed as a bachelor. If the husband earns only one dollar a day and the wife's work is worth two dollars a day then each get a real income equal to one dollar and a half a day. Secondly, what obscures the economic factors in this exchange is this,—the husband pays his wife with half (or a part) of his income not only for her housewifely labors but for her beauty and charm and because social custom makes him feel that he should share evenly with one who has agreed to share evenly with him. And the wife gives accordingly. How much of his salary, therefore, is paying for her household services cannot be determined by the fact that he gives her half, for part pays for cooking and scrubbing and part pays for love. If the cooking is bad but the loving good the home may be happy. If love is little but the cooking excellent the home may be endurable. But if both are lacking then we have a tragedy. And the same is true if the wife gives of her best efforts and the husband brings home little and loves less. So in the happy home there is more than an economic exchange; there is the payment not only in services and cash, but also "in kind." That the latter may be inestimable, we grant.

If this distinction be true then the question may fairly be raised whether a woman who is spoken of as a "parasite" by economists because she toils not neither does she spin, may give other values for which a man gladly sup-

THEORY OF VALUE

ports her. Why should a lovely woman of radiant personality be rated as a "dependent" of some man because she does not cook and scrub, while a singer is considered an economic producer?

What a husband gives his wife, therefore, reflects the earning power of the husband. A woman may be a blunderingly incompetent housewife, yet if her husband is a good worker she may live in ease and luxury. On the other hand, no matter how excellent she may be as a cook and general manager if her husband is incompetent she may live in as great want and misery as the slovenliest breadwinner in shop or factory. Here is where the houseworker has an advantage; when she sells her labor if the purchaser cannot pay a good wage she is at liberty to try another "place." Not so the wife. Her bargain is for life—she has bargained⁷ to exchange her labor, not for a day, but for a life-time.

For the products of a wife's efforts in cleaning house, preparing food, making, mending and washing clothes there is only one buyer, the husband;⁸ and when the man comes to exchange his money for goods in this line there is only one seller, the wife.

This is a condition of monopoly. When people lived in tribal groups this condition did not exist; neither did

⁷ The husband and wife do not usually make a definite agreement as to how the cash income is to be divided, but custom makes an economic relationship inhere in the marriage relationship; moreover, the courts will enforce a division of income.

⁸ She may work for herself instead of preparing goods for "the market" (her husband), but this is likely to lead to trouble, for the buyer in this case usually considers not that he is entitled to an amount of her products equivalent to his product, but that he has purchased *all her time* by the marriage contract; she does not usually feel this way towards him. Sometimes, however, especially when his earnings are small, he encourages her to make a little "pin money."

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

it exist in the patriarchal family ; nor does it exist in the large establishments of the present day, such as hotels and boarding houses, where there are many parties to the exchange and if a man does not like the product of the hotel cook he can obtain the product of another just as, in purchasing food, he can change from one store to another.⁹ But when the wife does the household work there is a monopoly condition and mankind has always chafed under these terms.

Because a couple agree to assume a monopoly contract as regards the production of children is no reason why they should accept a monopoly condition for other products unless they choose to isolate themselves in a frontier existence where the household must needs produce what it consumes and consume what it produces. This, however, makes for a static condition and human progress ceases. The larger the field for the exercise of free choice the greater the dynamic force toward progress.

One of the principal causes for the failure of many marriages is found in the fact that a love match has ended in an economic partnership for life, wherein the results of the labors of the man and woman are controlled by the law of monopoly. The fact that, in spite of this difficulty, love is often strong enough to prevent the development of a tragedy does not remove the difficulty. True, there should be such mutual affection that no marriage bonds are broken, but there also should be no succession of soggy pies and burnt steaks to put a strain upon affection. Minimizing a disruptive force may

⁹ One is reminded of the dyspeptic, who, when informed by his physician that he should change his cook, replied, "I can't do it, doctor, I'm married to her!"

THEORY OF VALUE

be as important a step in social progress as magnifying a unifying agency.

Having considered these various methods of valuing woman's household work (including Mrs. Gilman's idea of vicarious value, referred to on page 27, *supra.*), we return to the idea expressed on page 98, that the housewife's work can best be valued as that of any other worker, namely, by what she would have to pay to obtain someone else to do the same work, or by what she could obtain if she hired out to someone else to do the same work as an employee.¹⁰ Here a caution is necessary. Many have argued that if a woman before marriage has been, let us suppose, a schoolteacher earning a salary of \$1,200, therefore, when she marries, her labors are worth \$1,200 because that is her earning capacity. This, however, is a fallacy, for the value of a person's efforts in one line of work is not a measure of the value of other activities of the same person. If every man and woman were employed in that form of productive activity for which each is best fitted the world would be much richer than it now is.¹¹ As a general rule no other productive activities of normal men and women are as valuable to society as parenthood.

¹⁰ Seager, "Principles of Economics," page 174.

¹¹ Chapter IV, page 116, *infra.*

SECTION II

THE HOUSEWORKER'S WAGES

BEFORE attempting to place a valuation upon the work of the housewife it will be well to ascertain how much is customarily paid for the productive efforts of the houseworker, usually referred to as a servant.¹²

In Prof. Lucy M. Salmon's authoritative work on "Domestic Service"¹³ she finds that "the general servant who is expected to unite in herself all the functions of all the other employees becomes, on account of this fact, an unskilled worker, and, therefore, receives the lowest wages, whereas it is the skilled laborer—the cook—who commands the highest wages."

The most comprehensive attempt by any government authority in the United States to investigate domestic service was made in 1910 by the Commissioner of Labor of the State of Maine.¹⁴ Schedules of twenty questions were sent to 1,500 families and replies received from 291. "Replies far exceeded in number and completeness anything of the sort ever attempted in other States."

¹² In old English, "servant" was a term generally applied to any employee, his employer being spoken of as "master." The word at present conveys an idea of servility, and generally signifies domestic servants.

¹³ First edition, 1897, pages 88-9.

¹⁴ "The Household Servant Problem in Maine," in Report of Industrial and Labor Statistics.

THE HOUSEWORKER'S WAGES

The number of servants employed in the families investigated was 333. The weekly wages were as follows:

Wages	No. of Families
\$2.00	5
2.50	14
3.00	48
3.50	38
4.00	82
4.50	22
5.00	48
5.50	6
6.00	9
6.50	1
7.50	4
8.00	1
10.00	1

The average wage is about \$4. This also is by far the most frequent wage; 105 families pay less than this sum, and ninety pay more. Three and five dollars per week tie for second place; \$3.50 ranks fourth. The families paying \$3 to \$5 make up 85 per cent. of all the families. Four dollars a week is \$208 a year. Board and lodging, says the report, are \$3.50 in small towns and \$4.50 in cities. If we take the average, \$4, this will double the above annual wage, making it \$416.

Query 19 asks, "Do you employ domestic helpers by the hour?" One hundred and ninety-seven reply "yes," and fifty-two "no." The wages paid by those employing help by the hour are:

Wages per Hour	No. of Families
10 cents	11
12½ "	11
15 "	109
20 "	64
25 "	9
30 "	1

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

The average is $16\frac{1}{2}$ cents per hour. The most frequent is 15 cents. The answers to the query, "How many hours per day is servant expected to be on duty?" are as follows:

Hours	No. of Families
6	3
7	8
8	22
9	20
10	32
11	6
12	10
13	12
14	1
15	2
24	1

Sixty-seven families answer, "as many as the duties require"; six, "depends on the servant"; one says, "if I pay her her price for doing all my work she is expected to work until it is done"; another, "while she is in the house she may be called upon." The average is ten hours and this is also by far the most frequently mentioned.

Now, if the average hourly wages, $16\frac{1}{2}$ cents, be multiplied by the average hours, ten, we get a daily wage of \$1.65, and (allowing six hours on Sunday), a weekly wage of about \$10.50. The next most frequent number of hours, eight, multiplied by the next most frequent pay, 20 cents, would give nearly the same result. If we take ten hours a day at 15 cents an hour as the most usual arrangement, we have \$10 a week. To this should be added, let us say, \$1.25 for lunches, these being usually included in the compensation for a day's work. This gives us a total of \$11.25. This would be about a dollar and a quarter higher wages than would be paid in the Maine cities, if we assume that the \$5 per week wages,

THE HOUSEWORKER'S WAGES

\$4.50 for board and lodging and fifty cents for laundry, would be customary. As a matter of fact the number of hours' service is probably less when one works by the hour than by the week, while almost as much work is accomplished in the shorter time¹⁵ so that the actual cost is likely to be about the same and might be averaged at \$10 per week, or \$500 for a fifty-week year.

In the United States in 1906¹⁶ the average wage paid general laborers was 17 cents an hour (the average servant's wage in Maine inquiry was within half a cent of this); average hours per week fifty-eight, giving a weekly wage of \$9.86. It will thus be seen that servants in Maine receive as good wages as the average unskilled male worker in the United States.

Before leaving the subject of the houseworker's wages it will be interesting to apply to this special group of workers the principles mentioned by economists as determining the wages of industrial workers. In the chapter on wages, in Prof. Seager's "Principles of Economics," we find mentioned many factors which determine wages, the principal of which are:

1. Personal qualities.
2. Education and training.
3. Natural resources of the country.
4. Demand for and supply of labor and its products.
5. Right choice of work.
6. Influence.
7. Chance.
8. Custom.

¹⁵ Goldmark, Josephine, "Fatigue and Efficiency."

¹⁶ Bureau of Labor Report. A careful comparative study of the wages of unskilled male labor and houseworkers in any given part of the country will be of value. It will probably show very nearly an equal wage level.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

9. Use of capital.
10. Organization by labor.
11. Inertia.
12. Length of service.
13. Standard of living.
14. Steadiness of employment.
15. Social esteem.
16. Ability of employer.

Of these many factors, six would seem to be especially important as determining the income of houseworkers, namely, the natural resources of the country, which largely determine what the employer can afford to pay (ability of employer), custom, the personal qualities of the houseworker, her education and training (experience) and social esteem. Many housewives will acknowledge that their houseworker's labors are "worth" \$7 a week instead of the \$5 which they pay, but their income is such that if compelled to pay \$7 they would preferably do their own work. That custom¹⁷ is a large factor is shown by the fact that housewives will rather bitterly complain if a neighbor offers her own houseworker \$7 a week when they are paying \$5 or \$6, and this quite irrespective of the value of the service rendered. The veriest greenhorn at housework frequently asks and often gets the same wage as one who has had a lifetime of experience. That social esteem, or rather the lack of it, is a large factor in keeping up the wages of houseworkers is generally admitted.¹⁸ Many would probably enter this trade if it were not considered menial. This factor does not affect the housewife as it does the houseworker. Many a man can get a woman to cook and

¹⁷ Adam Smith refers to this fact.

¹⁸ Salmon, "Domestic Service."

THE HOUSEWORKER'S WAGES

scrub for him as his wife, although she would not be hired to do similar work at any wage, for custom sanctions the one as honorable and frowns upon the other.

An equally important consideration is the personal qualities of employer and employee, for when a business requires such intimate relationships much will depend upon personal idiosyncrasies which make continual friction. Managers of employment bureaus have repeatedly stated that we have no more of a "servant problem" than we have a problem of the employer with whom it is difficult for anyone to get along.

SECTION III

VALUE OF THE HOUSEWIFE'S WORK

THE conclusion was drawn in the last section that the wages of houseworkers appear to be about the same as those of unskilled male workers in the same locality. As many of these young women marry and keep house for themselves it would seem to be a reasonable conclusion that their labor when expended in their own home would be as valuable as when sold to a mistress. That the value of the household activities of the average wife of an unskilled workman is as great as the value of the labors of those who had formerly been houseworkers would probably be not far from the actual situation.

When we study, however, the work of the wives of men of the higher income groups, if we apply the rule that a housewife's services will be worth what she could earn doing the same work for someone else or what she would pay another woman for filling her position as housewife, then we find that few housewives rate the value of their services as highly as those of their well-paid partners.

The answers given in the household schedules to Query 36 (second section), "What do you consider the value in dollars, per month, of your present work as housekeeper?" were as follows:

VALUE OF THE HOUSEWIFE'S WORK

Value of Services	Number of Housewives
\$20	4
25	6
30	5
32	1
35	6
40	2
45	1
50	3
60	6
65	1
70	1
75	6
80	2
100	5
150	1

The average is \$53 ; the median is \$45 to \$50.

One woman writes, "As a mother willing to do it [household work] without pay; as a housekeeper, \$50." It is just this lack of understanding of the fact that no housewife is working without pay, that everyone is paid "in kind" (the living she gets) that makes this inquiry necessary. As the query did not state whether the "value in dollars" includes board and lodging, an assumption that the addition of a dollar a day for this would be a reasonable allowance, would, added to \$50, give \$80 per month or \$960 per year.

The wives of men of the \$1,800 to \$2,400 income group would, however, if employed elsewhere, very generally be capable of filling the positions of managing housekeepers, for although many housewives are not such clever housekeepers as are those who make a profession of this work and many of them also are not physically strong enough to do the work which they would require of another hired to fill a housekeeper's position, yet, on the other hand, many housewives produce far more of value in services than they can obtain from

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

hired workers. Inquiry at employment agencies¹⁹ shows that the usual wage for this type of service in Philadelphia is from \$30 to \$40 a month. The board, lodging, laundry and other privileges of these employees are valued at from \$30 to \$40 monthly, making a total of \$60 to \$80 a month or \$720 to \$960 yearly. The latter figure is the same as that found above to be the average of the estimates of their services made by the housewives answering the schedule inquiry.

These estimates cannot be accepted as conclusive, especially as averages, when applied to households having such widely varying conditions, can be only suggestive. The main purpose of such an attempted average is to call attention insistently to the fact that there is a tangible economic value which should be attached to household work, whether done by a hired worker or by the housewife.

¹⁹ Bureau of Occupations for Trained Women and commercial employment agencies.

CHAPTER IV
HOUSEHOLD WORK AS SPECIALIZED
GAINFUL OCCUPATIONS

HOUSEHOLD WORK AS SPECIALIZED GAINFUL OCCUPATIONS

WE start this chapter with the proposition that a normal family consists of a man, wife and three children, all under the legal working age, bound together by ties of mutual affection; the place in which they reside is a home. It is just as much home whether it is on the frontier where the family supplies practically all its wants directly by its own labor, or whether the group is residing in an apartment hotel where its economic needs are largely supplied in exchange for money. Thus we distinguish between a home and a household. In a hotel each family group makes a home of the room or rooms it occupies, there thus being many homes in the one structure, while the whole aggregate constitutes one household.

From the standpoint of the economist we are interested in this family as to whether it is thrifty¹ or thriftless, whether it is increasing its own, and the social, surplus,² or whether it represents a deficit and, therefore, a reduction in social capital, consuming more than it produces. If the latter family is poor it is ranked as dependent; if rich, it is parasitic—another form of dependency.

¹ Devine, "Economic Function of Women," page 10. "In the hands of its greatest masters economics has been a theory of prosperity rather than of value."

² See an interesting treatment of "The Conservation of the Social Surplus" in Patten's "Theory of Prosperity," 1902, pages 41-45. "The worth of life is not to be measured by the utility of goods consumed, but by [the social surplus] plus the pleasure of activity [joy in productive work] and æsthetic enjoyment of goods."

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

The same idea of social well being, expressed as surplus utility by the economist, becomes in the language of the sociologist a theory of progress, which has been excellently defined by a leading sociologist³ as follows:

"Social progress consists in passing on from one generation to the next all of the good (wealth, education, culture, etc.) received from the preceding generation, and still leaving for itself (the present generation) a larger and a fuller life." The mother who, in making every sacrifice for her children stunts and narrows her own life is not aiding social progress. Not only is she dwarfing her own life, but by that very process she becomes less able to give inspiration and a broad outlook to those who are supposed to be benefiting by her self-effacing sacrifices.

A number of writers on household management are of the opinion that few if any changes in our industrial system would so accentuate economic and social progress as would the complete separation of the home and economic production—in other words, the removal of practically all productive work from the home. This work could then be divided up into specialized occupations, such as cooking, sewing, laundering and cleaning. There would then be the chance for a woman to choose which occupation she prefers or she would have the opportunity to do some entirely different work if her talents lie in the direction of literature or art. When housework becomes standardized and professionalized we may expect to find it far more efficiently done than at present.⁴ Not only will the individual specialized worker tend to turn out a larger and a better product, but there

³ Prof. Franklin H. Giddings.

⁴ Gilman, Charlotte Perkins, "Woman and the Home."

AS SPECIALIZED GAINFUL OCCUPATIONS

will be an enormous saving of time and materials in having the meals for a hundred families prepared in one kitchen instead of in a hundred kitchens.⁵

So much has already been written concerning the advantages of professionalizing household work, that it is not necessary to elaborate these views.⁶ It is worth our while, however, to consider what will be the probable effect upon the woman and upon the family.

Many economists today hold that the development of human beings follows the law of economic determinism, that is, that the conditions under which we earn our daily bread determine our religion, our morals, our art, indeed, our whole business and social life. If, then, there is a revolutionary change in our methods of bread-winning, there will inevitably result alterations in our social life. For instance, the whole daily life of a family changes when they move from the no-servant class into the servant-employing class. The wife then can have greater opportunity to become socially acquainted with her neighbors, read the daily papers, and so be able to discuss matters of common interest with her husband and even to leave the baby at night so that she may go out with him. Quite as revolutionary are the alterations in habits of daily life when a family falls from the servant-employing class into the no-servant class. The wife may by that one fact alone lose her whole grip on her husband's interest by being unable to go out with him or by being too tired at night to make herself an agreeable companion. If she be not gifted in cookery and can no longer hire one versed in that art, the man may begin

⁵ Gilman, Charlotte Perkins, "What Diantha Did"; a readable novel.

⁶ Thompson, Robert Ellis, "The History of the Dwelling House."

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

to find it convenient to take his evening dinners downtown, and so the family life is threatened.

If, as some maintain, the main force holding the family together at the present time is the economic dependence of the wife upon her husband, then the removal of work from the home will break this binding tie. If this were true, one would only have to hear John Stuart Mill's terrific arraignment of such a system in his "Subjection of Women" to realize that family life based on such a bond is certainly not desirable for the woman, however it may please the fancy of the man.

Quite as interesting are the views of Mrs. Mill, who, in an article in the *Westminster Gazette*,¹ discussing "laying open to women the employments now monopolized by men" and the tendency to lower wages, says: "The worst ever asserted, much worse than is at all likely to be realized, is that if women competed with men, a man and a woman could not together earn more than is now earned by the man alone. Let us make this supposition, the most unfavorable supposition possible: the joint income of the two would be the same as before, while the woman would be raised from the position of that of a servant to that of a partner. Even if every woman, as matters now stand, had a claim on some man for support, how infinitely preferable is it that part of the income should be of the woman's earning, even if the aggregate sum were but little increased by it, rather than that she should be compelled to stand aside in order that men may be the sole earners, and the sole dispensers of what is earned. Even under the present laws respecting the property of women, a woman who contributes materially

¹ July, 1851. "Enfranchisement of Women"; reprinted in J. S. Mill's "Dissertations and Discussions" (1859-74, Vol. II).

AS SPECIALIZED GAINFUL OCCUPATIONS

to the support of the family, cannot be treated in the same contemptuously tyrannical manner as one who, however she may toil as a domestic drudge, is a dependent on the man for subsistence."

In a footnote, Mrs. Mill continues: "The truly horrible effects of the present state of the law among the lowest of the working population, is exhibited in those cases of hideous maltreatment of their wives by workingmen, with which every newspaper, every police report, teems. Wretches unfit to have the smallest authority over any living thing, have a helpless woman for their household slave. These excesses could not exist if women both earned, and had the right to possess, a part of the income of the family."

As a matter of fact, women who today wish to be independent may obtain their livelihood in some occupation outside of the home, so those who enter the matrimonial state evidently largely do so because they prefer that life and are not so often forced into marriage by economic necessity as was formerly the case. But we will suppose that after marriage the woman continues the profession which she had before marriage. Then those women who on account of their greater economic freedom have control of their own persons and refuse to become mothers will remain childless and that type of woman will die out. Those who have strong desires for motherhood, in spite of their economic freedom, will continue to bear children and so will reproduce their kind. If by this means the unwelcome children born into the world decrease, will society be the worse off? Evidently, while there will be a temporary decrease in the birth rate, there will in the end be an increase in the proportion of children who inherit from their mothers

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

strong parental instincts, making them in their turn good fathers and mothers.

Furthermore, there are today thousands of men and women who refuse to marry because they cannot live decently on the \$9 a week which the man is able to earn. But if the woman also has a profession, then both can live upon \$18 (even allowing for the fact that they will have to pay someone to cook and wash for them), especially if cooking is done in central kitchens for many families. Under such circumstances marriages would possibly take place more generally, even though the woman would have to lay aside other work during the years of child-bearing. There will probably be fewer spinsters and bachelors when the man and the woman discover that under such a plan two can live together more cheaply than one; add to this the fact that the man will realize that he will not be dependent on the possibility of good cooking by one woman all his life; and the realization by the woman that marriage means not a life of drudgery but a continuance in her chosen profession, with only the bond of pure affection between herself and another,—will this destroy family life?

Our present industrial system, which makes the wife dependent upon the man as sole "breadwinner," is a potent cause of low wages throughout the world. The single man can afford to strike, but the married man is handicapped. He is the stumbling-block to progress, for he cannot bear to see his wife and children starve. But if the wife is also earning a regular salary, then the married man will be in a stronger position than the single man is today, for though the woman's wage alone may not be able to maintain the family in comfort, it will at least tide them over a temporary strain.

AS SPECIALIZED GAINFUL OCCUPATIONS

One reason why women have been underbidding men in the labor market is because the woman has been willing both to do a day's work in an office or shop and then come home to do a half-day's work at housework, getting her meals, repairing and washing her clothing. The man will not piece out a small wage in this way.

In this discussion of housework the care of the children has been continually kept in mind as a part of the housewife's profession. When the mother becomes a special worker, what effect will that have upon the children? Whatever it may be, it hardly could be worse than the condition now existing amongst the working classes in our large cities, for the wage of a mill or factory hand being on the average only one-half enough to pay for proper food, clothing and shelter for a family of five, no matter how thoughtful the mother may be, in many cases she cannot save the babies from anæmia or tuberculosis. What time and inspiration has she, a poor overworked drudge, to study and plan the best methods for the physical care, the intellectual guidance and the moral training of her undesired progeny? The little toddlers are only in the way all day while she is trying to get her work done; what man would work under such a handicap? But in certain communities, while the woman, who may be an excellent seamstress, goes out to work for eight hours, her children are at the schoolhouse under the care of a special expert in child training.⁸ If the woman works eight hours a day at her profession, she still has eight hours a day for family life. She will enjoy her children more and give them better care if she has them for eight hours a day than if they are at her heels for

⁸ At Gary, Indiana, the school assumes responsibility for the children for eight hours daily, partly in school-room work and partly in playing games.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

sixteen hours out of the twenty-four. Mothers of three or four lively youngsters will generally admit that they dread Saturdays and holidays, especially if they belong to the no-servant class of housewives. The man who objects to such a plan on the ground that it will "destroy the home" will do well to prove his strong parental affection by giving up a half of his much-prized leisure hours to the care of his children. He will then realize that what is a joy the first hour becomes a duty the second, and a burden the third, hour.

Furthermore, at both ends of the social scale we will find many women giving little or no time to housework. The parasitic woman⁹ who spends a considerable part of her time in dressing and adding to her personal attractiveness may, through her beautiful appearance, be creating values for which her husband gladly pays by maintaining her in luxury, but we will hardly include her amongst housewives unless she does directly manage her household.

The woman who works at sweated trades, making garments ten and twelve hours a day in her "home," is nine-tenths an industrial worker and only one-tenth a houseworker. The wife who goes out to work all day in a factory is the same. Then there are many members of the working class whose standard of living is still that of their ancestors, when the woman gave most of her time to spinning and weaving or working in the fields, for the mud hovel required little, and received less, care, while the diet of mush and stews was too simple to require a large display of the science of cookery. The ancient forms of work are now being taken away from the woman, and the wife of the day laborer has not

⁹ Veblen, T., "Theory of the Leisure Class." Chapter IV, "Conspicuous Consumption."

AS SPECIALIZED GAINFUL OCCUPATIONS

learned, or the family income does not permit her to indulge in, those activities which are required to meet such desires as clean, comfortable homes, the careful preparation of a varied menu and suitable attention to the physical needs and mental and moral guidance of the children. She therefore spends few hours in productive household labor. Even though she dawdles about the house all day, the total output is small. Economists emphasize three points as determining the productivity of workers: First, the capacity of the individual worker; second, whether he produces directly or indirectly (uses capital in the form of labor-saving machinery, etc.); third, whether he works individually or in co-operation with others.¹⁰ Manufacturing is today nearly all carried on by indirect (capitalistic) methods, while there is great division of labor. Agriculture is gradually following along the same lines. If the division of labor and the use of labor-saving devices have so vastly increased the productivity of our factories, what might they accomplish for household work?

¹⁰ Seager, "Principles of Economics," page 135.

CHAPTER V

STUDENT SERVICE AT COLLEGE HALL

STUDENT SERVICE AT COLLEGE HALL

EDUCATION today increasingly includes the practical with the theoretical; we are learning by doing things as well as by studying in books how they ought to be done. Schools of Household Science are realizing that in addition to having students prepare samples according to each recipe, a larger experience is necessary for efficiency in preparing meals for an institution with a hundred residents, or even for a family of five. For, besides the ability to produce correctly cooked dishes, there are other qualities the development of which require just as careful training. The necessity of learning to see what work needs to be done, and to put work through—that is, to get it done in a definite time—is of prime importance.

Neither is instruction in household science in our colleges limited to the preparation of teachers. There is an increasing movement amongst various institutions to reorganize their household management, replacing servants with houseworkers having a higher degree of training and skill, in charge of thoroughly educated and experienced household science graduates. This opens a splendid new field of opportunity for the student of household science.¹

As the view gains ground that higher educational training should be for not only such professions as those of lawyers and doctors, but is beneficial to all, society begins

¹ A certain Philadelphia institution will next year replace domestic servants with trained workers.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

to realize that to adequately provide for this would be a heavy burden to place upon the community, nor can most parents afford to feed, clothe and house the growing generation for six to eight years beyond the grammar school grades. Thus it becomes necessary to devise means by which students may work their way through college. Not only is this desirable from a financial standpoint, but there are many who believe that the self-reliance and added interest in, and value placed upon, their training thus gained, makes this method preferable for all young people. That work may be as pleasurable as play, is abundantly evidenced by the artist who is happiest when busy at his chosen profession. That household work may be made enjoyable through a correct appreciation of its skillful handling is equally possible.

It hardly requires argument to prove that most people consider housework done for hire as menial. To raise this work to an equal standing with that of the trained nurse or kindergartner is highly desirable.

With the aim of attempting to attain the above enumerated advantages for the household science students of Temple University,² the author assumed financial responsibility for College Hall (see Appendix C), a hotel at Ocean Grove, New Jersey, accommodating sixty guests. This was run as any other seashore hotel, except that no servants were employed. All of the work, from cleaning the building to cooking, serving and laundry work, was done by Temple University students, except that in the rush of the season extra assistance was given by

² Temple University was founded thirty years ago by Dr. Russell H. Conwell, who is still its honored president. The student body at present exceeds 3,000. Many of the students are working part time while seeking higher education. The main buildings are located at Broad and Berks Streets, Philadelphia.

STUDENT SERVICE AT COLLEGE HALL

several young women from other colleges and from the Asbury Park summer home of the Philadelphia Y. W. C. A. Only one rule not customary in most hotels was enforced,—no smoking was permitted anywhere about the premises. This cost a loss of patronage amounting probably to several hundred dollars, but it is hoped that in the long run there will be enough people who appreciate this arrangement to more than compensate for the initial loss.

A woman experienced in school lunch room work had oversight of the culinary department until the middle of the summer, when, at her own request, she was released. The management were fortunate in securing to fill this vacancy the services of a woman of rare attainments who had had years of experience in hotel work. In previous years the cooking in this hotel had been mostly done with a large French range in the basement, the food sent upstairs on a dumb-waiter and kept warm on a small stove in the pantry. Food was prepared in the basement. In place of this arrangement, a six-burner gas range was installed on the main floor and the food prepared in an adjoining room. In the construction of the building a cupboard had been placed so low over the sink that anyone washing dishes must bend over at an angle of almost 45 degrees, yet none of the previous proprietors had apparently cared enough about the conditions under which their servants were working to end such a hardship. This was easily remedied by cutting away the lower section of the cupboard.

The heavier work about the house and the repair work was done by a capable young man of the Temple Physical Education Department, who took hold of the work not only conscientiously, but with deep interest. While those who proved to be especially efficient in any given line

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

of work spent most of their time at those tasks, an effort was made to exchange occupations, so that all might have some experience not only in cooking and sewing, but also in chamberwork, laundering and cleaning.

The ideal aimed at was to place the work upon an eight-hour day basis, but the first season this could not be attained, through the lack of a sufficient working force. Several students who agreed to assist at College Hall in August, changed their plans for the summer, and there was difficulty in filling their places on short notice. The hotel was open from June 15th to September 15th. A few students assisted all summer, but many came for a term of four or six weeks. No special sleeping quarters were assigned to the students. In June, when the house was only partly filled, they had at times the best rooms in the house. In August it was necessary to double up, but at no time were the accommodations of the student workers less attractive than those offered to guests. Those assistants who were not engaged in cooking or serving meals ate with the guests. There was never the least friction or objection by the guests to the students using the parlor as freely as anyone else. The wish was frequently expressed that the students join the guests as often as possible to chat with them or to make up swimming or boating parties.

When positions had in previous years been secured for students in seashore hotels, the managers refused to permit them to sit in the parlors or on the verandas or to eat in the dining-room, saying that the guests objected to having those who served them mingle with them as their equals. Furthermore, if the manager treated the students with more consideration than the other house-workers, the latter objected to the discrimination, while if the students were treated as "servants," they objected.

STUDENT SERVICE AT COLLEGE HALL

One of the finest happenings of the season occurred when a Temple graduate in household science, who was stopping at one of the most exclusive hotels in the resort, willingly came and waited on the table for three successive days until a delayed assistant from Teachers' College, Columbia, arrived.

That work can be made joyful when done in the spirit of fellowship, was experienced to a remarkable degree. Never did anyone have to be ordered to do any work, and students frequently had to be urged to stop in order to obtain the required rest. That this eagerness to be of service did not spring from any mercenary motives is proven by the fact that any of these students might readily have obtained positions paying a higher salary in hotels run on a commercial basis. A salary of twenty cents an hour was paid, and out of this students paid their board and lodging on practically the same basis as the guests.

When some such plan as this is worked out on an all-the-year-round basis, it will make it possible for students to pay for board, lodging and tuition while learning their profession in the most practical and useful way.³

All the workers kept time-record cards of the work they did, so that in making out the budget it is possible to ascertain the cost of each line of work.

Financially, this first year the returns did not cover the outlay. This was principally due to the shark scare

³It is hoped that someone interested in this practical self-supporting educational method for young women will furnish an endowment by means of which such work can be carried on, or, money invested in such a way could both pay customary interest rates and help many young women to higher opportunities in life.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

(a man at a nearby resort having been killed by a shark while swimming in the ocean), and the fear of infantile paralysis, both of which causes kept many families at home or sent them to the mountain resorts.

CHAPTER VI

BUDGETS AND BUDGET MAKING

SECTION I

ANALYSIS OF FORTY BUDGETS

THE scientific analysis of the household budget has been a development of the past two decades. Most of the studies made have concerned themselves with the expenditures of families on small incomes.¹ Chapin found that a family in New York City living on less than \$900 annual income would suffer from malnutrition, overcrowding, would be underclothed, or would have to exercise the closest economy and spend all of the family income with above the average care and foresight in order to avoid these conditions. Mrs. Bruère² decides that an income of \$1,000 is required to maintain a family in "decency" and \$1,200 for "efficiency," and these incomes do not permit saving, except at the expense of decency or efficiency. Prof. Marshall, the English economist, states that "The average income per head in the United Kingdom, which was about £15 in 1820, is about £37 now; *i. e.*, it has risen from about £75 to £185 per family of five; and its purchasing power is nearly as great as that of £400 in 1820. A few artisans' families earn about £185 [about \$900], and would not gain by an equal distribution of wealth; but they have only enough for a healthy and many-sided life."³

¹ Chapin, R. C., "The Cost of Living Among Working Men's Families in New York City" (1909). More, Mrs. L. B., "Wage-Earners' Budgets" (1907). Streightoff, F. H., "The Standard of Living Among the Industrial People of America" (1911).

² Bruère, Martha B. and R. W., "Increasing Home Efficiency" (1913).

³ Marshall, Alfred, "Principles of Economics" (1907).

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

Further information regarding the budgets of middle-class families seemed desirable, so twenty students of the Household Science Class of 1914 at Temple University, Philadelphia, and the same number in 1915, obtained detailed budgets from their own or other families, according to a schedule prepared for them. Nearly every family had children and the average size is nearly that of the normal family of man, wife and three children. In addition an intensive study was made of a normal family having an income of \$1,800; also of a family expending \$2,400. The first column of figures in the following table gives the average expenditure, under each heading of the budget, of the families reported by the Class of 1915, followed by the percentage expenditure. In the third column the same facts are given for the Class of 1914. On comparing expenditures by the various families, it was found that under each budget heading most of the families would have an expenditure approximating a certain sum most generally expended (called the "mode" by statisticians), while others would range far above or below these figures. The latter were then discarded and the "average of the most frequent" ascertained, as given below :

ANALYSIS OF FORTY BUDGETS

SUMMARY OF BUDGETS

	Average		Average		Average of Most Frequent		Average of Most Frequent		A Normal Family: Income \$1800		A Normal Family: Income \$2400	
	1915	%	1914	%	1915	%	1914	%	\$	%	\$	%
Food	\$511	27	\$529	26½	\$468	28½	\$517	29	\$540	30	\$720	30
Clothing	353	19	404	20	288	17½	342	19	270	15	380	15
Shelter	273	14½	306	15	249	15	300	17	360	20	480	20
Operation	261	14	247	12½	232	14	175	10	360	20	480	20
Advancement	296	16	343	17	253	15½	234	13	180	10	240	10
Sundries	85	4½	54	2½	75	4½	48	3	36	2	48	2
Savings	100	5	135	6½	78	5	158	9	54	3	72	3
	\$1879	100	\$2018	100	\$1643	100	\$1774	100	\$1800	100	\$2400	100

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

The incomes and expenditures of the forty budgets average about \$1,800. A careful study of the tables following leads to the conclusion that in the city of Philadelphia, in the year 1915, an income of \$1,800 will secure for a family of five only a moderate living, while \$2,400 is required for "comfortable" family life.

A study of how the income is divided under the major headings shows that Food claims nearly 30 per cent. on the average. Mrs. Richards⁴ suggested 25 per cent., but food prices have risen since her day more rapidly than have the prices of other necessities of life. In low-income budgets, Food runs up to 40 per cent. Clothing has almost uniformly been placed at 15 per cent. in budgets of both high and low incomes, but in these class budgets it is found to be nearer 20 per cent. The old saying of a week's pay for a month's rent does not hold good for these studies, Shelter averaging in the class budgets nearer 15 per cent. than 25 per cent. or even 20 per cent. Operation claims only 10 to about 15 per cent. in the class budgets, showing a small outlay for wages and leaving, therefore, a larger amount for Advancement and Savings.

Detailed tables under the major headings give the expenditures under each minor heading. In each table the columns headed "Highest" and "Lowest" represent the sum expended by that family in the class budgets which spent the most or the least for a given article, as butter, milk, etc.

⁴ Richards, Ellen H., "The Cost of Living."

ANALYSIS OF FORTY BUDGETS

EXPENDITURES FOR FOOD

	Average, 1915	Average, 1914	Highest, 1915	Highest, 1914	Lowest, 1915	Lowest, 1914	Most frequent, 1915	Most frequent, 1914	Av. of most frequent, 1915	Av. of most frequent, 1914	Δ normal family: \$1,800 income	Δ normal family: \$2,400 income
All Food	511	529	1014	895	218	194	329-665	434-597	468	517	540	720
Meat and fish	158	137	360	260	38	45	90-182	95-139	133	115	104	156
Eggs	34	35	109	55	13	15	20-37	21-55	26	37	31	55
Butter	42	40	115	62	13	21	26-50	31-50	38	42	47	50
Milk	45	47	104	91	14	16	25-50	35-60	37	47	87	102
Bread	43	38	106	75	8	14	35-55	30-95	44	37	55	83
Cereals	8	8.5	30	20	1	1	5-10	4-10	7	7	13	18
Vegetables	75	82	232	387	5	12	24-54	45-85	36	63	60	90
Fruits	34	43	100	76	9	11	20-30	30-76	26	50	36	50
Beverages	18	13	55	31	2	5	15-25	5-21	20	12	15	18
Sweets & condiments	22	20	52	51	5	3	10-20	8-30	16	20	20	23
Ice	19	13	80	25	0.5	4	5-20	6-21	12	13	12	15
Sundries	38	20	165	69	4	2	5-50	10-34	15	20	15	15
Meals purchased	18	56	37	120	6	15	10-25	15-75	16	45	45	45
Total	554	552.5							426	508		

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

MEAT AND FISH: \$104 a year allows \$2 weekly; \$156 allows \$3 weekly.

EGGS: \$31 pays for two dozen eggs weekly at 30 cents; \$55 would purchase three dozen at 35 cents.

BUTTER: \$47 pays for two and one-half pounds weekly at 35 cents; \$50 will cover the same amount at 40 cents. If butterine or oleomargarine is purchased, three and one-half pounds may be obtained weekly for \$50.

MILK: \$87 buys three quarts of milk daily at 8 cents; \$102 buys three and one-half quarts at 8 cents.* Note that the average spent for milk in the class budgets is hardly over one-half the sum allowed on an \$1,800 income. The lowest sums expended, \$14 and \$16, would purchase one pint of milk daily at 8 cents a quart.

BREAD: Under this heading are included flour, biscuits, crackers, cake, but not pies; \$55 allows 15 cents daily; \$83 allows 20 cents daily, plus 20 cents a week.

CEREALS: \$13 allows 25 cents weekly; \$18 allows 35 cents weekly. The average of the forty budgets is hardly over one-half of the allowance in the \$1,800 budget. Dietitians recommend a freer use of cereals, particularly for families in which careful economy is desirable.

VEGETABLES: \$60 allows \$5 a month; \$90 allows \$7.50 monthly. The small allowance for vegetables in some budgets is due to the fact that such families have gardens on which to draw for supplies and fail to include in their budgets a fair price for the produce therefrom.

* Milk having risen to nine cents a quart in this vicinity, only about two and one-half and three quarts, respectively, may now be purchased by above expenditures.

ANALYSIS OF FORTY BUDGETS

FRUITS: \$36 is 70 cents a week; \$50 is a little under \$1 weekly. Fruits are considered by some people as luxuries, but the more we learn of the values of the mineral salts (see p. 87, footnote), the more the appropriations are increased under this heading.

BEVERAGES: \$15 and \$18 will cover an expenditure of 30 and 35 cents a week, respectively. This would hardly cover the sums expended by families using spirituous liquors,* and barely suffices for the devotees of the less baneful drinks, tea and coffee. It is adequate to cover cereal drinks, with some cocoa and chocolate.

SWEETS AND CONDIMENTS: This heading includes sugar, salt, spices, molasses, jams and jellies, but not candy; \$20 and \$23 will allow 40 and 45 cents a week, respectively.

ICE: As only a small portion of ice used is taken as a drink, but most of it is used for the preservation of food, some budget-makers include this item under Operation; \$12 allows 40 cents, and \$15 allows 50 cents, for thirty weeks.

SUNDRIES: Includes expenditures for nuts, ice cream, pies and other bought desserts and extras; \$15 will allow 30 cents weekly.

MEALS PURCHASED: \$45 is the cost of a 15-cent lunch daily for 300 days. If more than one member of a family is buying daily lunches, some other item must be reduced. If all the family get all meals at home, this \$45 can be expended under other headings.

* When liquors are not served on the table, make entry under "spending money." (See p. 152, *infra*.)

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

EXPENDITURES FOR CLOTHING (HUSBAND).^{*}

	Average, 1915	Average, 1914	Highest, 1915	Highest, 1914	Lowest, 1915	Lowest, 1914	Most frequent, 1915	Most frequent, 1914	Average, 1915	Average, 1914	A normal family, \$1,800 income	A normal family, \$2,400 income
ALL CLOTHING	118	115	290	181	50	55	75-126	97-151	98	119	81	108
Overcoats	15	16	40	25	3	7	15-20	10-20	17.5	15	11	17
Suits	37	41.5	100	75	12	12	20-50	40-50	33.5	45.7	25.5	38
Shirts	8	8.5	25	18	2.25	4	5-7	6-8	5.5	7.3	4.5	6
Underwear	8.25	7.5	25	20	3	2.5	5	5-8	5	6.6	4	4
Nightshirts												
Hosiery	3.25	3.5	8	12	1.5	1.5	2-3	2-3	2.6	2.7	1.5	2
Shoes	12.25	11.3	30	20	5	7	10-12	7-15	11	10.3	9.5	10.5
Overshoes	1.25	.95	3	2	.75	.40	.75-1.25	.75-1	1	.90	1	2
Hats	6.25	5	22	8	1	3	4-7	4-5	5	4.4	4.5	4.5
Umbrellas	2.25	1.5	5	4.5	1	.25	1	1	1	1	1	1.5
Gloves	2.5	2.3	6	3.5	1	1.5	1.5-3	1.5-3	2	2.3	1	1.5
Handkerchiefs	2.3	1.5	10	4	.5	.5	1-3	.5-3	1.75	1.5	1	1.75
Collars and cuffs	2	2.5	5	6.25	.5	.75	1-3	1.25-3	2	2.1	1.75	2
Neckties	2.5	2.5	5	6	.5	1	1-5	1-3	2.5	2	1.5	2
Sundries	8.75	3.75	32	10	.5	1	2-15	2-5	7.5	3.5	2	3
Laundry	15	12	75	26	1	5	4-8	5-13	6	9	9.5	9.5
Total,	126.55	120.3							103.85	114.3		

^{*} For explanation of table headings, see pp. 136 and 138.

ANALYSIS OF FORTY BUDGETS

The \$1,800 and \$2,400 budgets allow the husband 30 per cent. of the total family expenditure for clothing.

OVERCOATS: \$11 will allow \$6 for one-third of an \$18 winter overcoat (that is, it must last for three seasons), \$3 for one-fifth of a \$15 spring overcoat and \$2 for one-sixth of a \$12 raincoat; \$17 will pay for one-third of a \$24 winter coat, one-fourth of a \$20 spring coat and one-fifth of a \$20 raincoat.

SUITS: \$25.50 will pay for three-quarters (three suits in four years) of a \$16 summer suit and three-quarters of an \$18 winter suit; \$38 will pay for an \$18 summer suit and a \$20 winter suit. (Or, two \$18 suits and set aside \$2 toward a \$40 dress suit to last 20 years.)

SHIRTS: \$4.50 for one \$1.50 shirt and three at \$1; \$6 for two \$1.50 shirts and three at \$1.

UNDERWEAR: \$4 for four \$1 union suits.

NIGHTSHIRTS: Included in sundries in class budgets; \$2 for two at \$1; \$3 for two at \$1.50.

HOSIERY: \$1.50 for one dozen at 12½ cents; \$2 for the same, plus two pairs at 25 cents.

SHOES: \$9.50 for two pairs at \$3.50, repaired twice at \$1.25; \$10.50 for two pairs at \$4, repaired twice at \$1.25.

OVERSHOES: \$1 for one pair; \$2 for two pairs. Some men do not wear overshoes. (Add sum saved by so doing to allowance for doctor's bills!)

HATS: \$4.50 for one \$2 straw hat and one \$2.50 felt hat. If purchased at end of season, this expenditure will procure \$3 and \$4 hats at above prices.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

UMBRELLAS: The appropriation of \$1 or \$1.50 will suffice, if the umbrella is neither loaned, lost nor stolen! Otherwise, draw on sundries allowance.

GLOVES: \$1 and \$1.50 will secure a pair of gloves annually; some prefer to pay \$2, even though this may mean a biennial purchase.

HANDKERCHIEFS: 75 cents for half a dozen; \$1 buys the same, plus one 25-cent handkerchief.

COLLARS AND CUFFS: \$1.75 for eight collars at 12½ cents and three pairs of cuffs at 25 cents.

NECKTIES: \$1.50 for four ties at 25 cents and one at 50 cents; \$2 allows an additional 50-cent tie to above.

SUNDRIES: Includes bath-robcs, suspenders, garters, belts, collar, cuff and stud buttons, suits cleaned, pressed and repaired. Also nightshirts, in class budgets.

LAUNDRY: \$9.50 pays for one shirt at 10 cents, two collars at 2 cents each, one pair of cuffs at 4 cents, weekly, plus 14 cents a year for extras.

ANALYSIS OF FORTY BUDGETS

EXPENDITURES FOR CLOTHING (WIFE).*

	Average, 1915	Average, 1914	Highest, 1915	Highest, 1914	Lowest, 1915	Lowest, 1914	Most frequent, 1915	Most frequent, 1914	Average of most frequent, 1915	Average of most frequent, 1914	A normal family, \$1,800 income	A normal family, \$2,400 income
ALL CLOTHING	155	139	610	285	38	46	75-228	78-147	130	132	95	126
Coats and furs	48	23	190	75	7	6	7-50	10-20	24	14.5	10	12
Suits		21.25		50		5.5		10-20		15	15	20
Dresses	38	30	125	70	8	6	15-40	20-50	24	30	10	14
Waists	11.75	10	28	15	2	2.5	8-25	6-10	15	7.75	7	9
Skirts and petticoats	10	7.5	25.5	21	2	1	5-15	5-10	9	7.5	5	8
Underwear	10.75	8.75	40	20	.75	2.5	5-10	5-11	7.25	7.5	9	12
Nightgowns												
Hosiery	4	4	10	10	.75	1	1.5-6	1-6	4	3.25	3	4
Shoes	11.5	11	30	20	3	5	8-12	5-20	9	11.5	8.5	10.5
Overshoes	1	.75	4	1.20	.50	.50	.75-1	.75	.75	.75	.75	.75
Hats	12.5	14.5	40.5	35	3	4	5-15	10-20	9.5	14	11	14
Umbrellas	2.5	1.25	5	5	.50	.50	1-5	1	2.75	1	1.5	2.5
Gloves	4.75	4	15.5	8	1.50	2	2-3	2-5	3.25	3.5	2	3
Handkerchiefs	2.25	1.75	5	5	.50	.50	1-5	.75-3	2.25	1.5	1.25	2.25
Sundries	12	9	40	16	1.5	2	2-10	10-15	5.5	12.5	7	10
Total	169	146.75							116.25	130.25		
Husband, wife and children	353	404	1055	938	117	161	190-385	280-398	288	342	270	360

* For explanation of table headings, see pp. 136 and 138.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

The \$1,800 and \$2,400 budgets allow the wife 35 per cent. of the total family expenditure for clothing. The average for the class budgets is about 50 per cent. higher than the \$1,800 allowance under this head.

COATS AND FURS: \$10 and \$12 seem to be small allowances under this heading, but unless the mother has secured furs before the children are added to the family, she is unlikely to secure them on an \$1,800 or even a \$2,400 income.

SUITS: \$15 and \$20 allow one tailor-made suit annually (summer and winter suits must be worn two years if both are purchased), or a \$30 and \$40 suit biennially, or a \$22.50 and \$30 summer and winter suit every third year. (The budgets of the Class of 1915 gave expenditures for suits under "Coats and Furs.")

DRESSES: \$10 for two house dresses at \$1, one dress at \$3, and one-third of an \$18 dress; \$14 for same, except one-half of \$18 dress.

WAISTS: \$7 for two waists at \$1, one at \$2 and one at \$3; \$9 for two waists at \$1, one at \$3 and one at \$4.*

SKIRTS AND PETTICOATS: Expenditures under this heading will vary with individual tastes, some preferring skirts and waists and others preferring dresses.

UNDERWEAR: Includes lingerie, corsets, etc.

NIGHTGOWNS: \$4 for four at \$1. (Included with underwear in class budgets.)

* If amounts allowed for dresses, waists and skirts are used to purchase material, and these garments are made at home, the housewife will be better dressed than if ready-made goods are purchased.

ANALYSIS OF FORTY BUDGETS

HOSIERY: \$3 for six pairs at 33 1-3 cents, two pairs at 50 cents; \$4 for same, plus one pair of silk stockings at \$1.

SHOES: \$8.50 for two pairs at \$3.50, repaired twice at 75 cents; \$10.50 for one pair at \$4, one pair at \$4.50, repaired twice at \$1.

OVERSHOES: 75 cents for one pair. Some persons buy a pair of overshoes with each pair of shoes. Some budgets had no expenditures under this heading,—a doubtful economy.

HATS: \$11 for one at \$4, one at \$5 and one made over for \$2; \$14 for one at \$5, one at \$6 and one made over for \$3.

UMBRELLAS: See note under umbrellas for husband.

GLOVES: The only item for which the lowest expenditure in the 1914 class budgets is the same as in the \$1,800 budget; \$2 for one pair at \$1 and two pairs at 50 cents; \$3 for one pair at \$1.50, one pair at \$1 and one pair at 50 cents.

HANDKERCHIEFS: \$1.25 for six for a dollar and one at 25 cents; \$2.25 for six for a dollar and five at 25 cents.¹⁰

SUNDRIES: Ties, collars, belts, garters, jewelry, repairs, cleaning, laundry and materials for clothing made in home.

¹⁰ Handkerchiefs, gloves and umbrellas are so frequently received as gifts that some men and women (especially the latter) might be able to transfer all of the allowances under these headings to "Gifts to friends" (see p. 153, *infra*), to cover the expense of gifts made in exchange for gifts received.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

Expenditures for children's clothing were not requested in detail in the class budgets. In the \$1,800 and \$2,400 budgets, 35 per cent. of the total family expenditure for clothing is allotted to the children.

ANALYSIS OF FORTY BUDGETS

EXPENDITURES FOR RENT, OPERATION, SUNDRIES AND SAVINGS.^a

	Average, 1915	Average, 1914	Highest, 1915	Highest, 1914	Lowest, 1915	Lowest, 1914	Most frequent, 1915	Most frequent, 1914	Average of most frequent, 1915	Average of most frequent, 1914	A normal family; \$1,800 income	A normal family; \$2,400 income
RENT	273	306	600	420	120	216	204-300	300	249	300	360	480
OPERATION	261	247	904	805	47	74	142-330	100-237	232	175	360	480
Heat	58	68	151	147	15	33	36-70	40-75	54	58	62	66
Light	35	32	89	54	2.5	12	15-36	25-45	24.5	32	36	36
Telephone	24.5	20.3	65	36	1.5	2.5	10-30	12-24	22	18	26	26
Refurnishing	40.25	57	110	170	8	12	27-35	26.5-67	37.75	41	34	45
Wages	200	138	780	444	42	3	75-204	30-84	138	57	194	300
Cleaning materials	13.25	7.5	50	20	2	2	8-25	2-10	14	5.5	8	7
Total	371	322.8							290.25	211.5		
ADVANCEMENT	296	343	835	936	57	81	155-389	144-344	253	234	180	240
Health	27	51	100	102	1.5	12	10-25	30-50	18	40.5	18	24
Recreation	70	124	340	560	5	18	20-100	50-110	44	71.0	36	48
Education	114	54	400	200	10	5	20-260	23-57	96	38	54	72
Beneficence	79	93	235	387	5	10	36-100	72-150	65	117	72	96
Total	290	322							223	266.5		
SUNDRIES	85	54	240	160	5	3	35-150	25-70	75	48	36	48
SAVINGS	100	135	400	323	3.5	20	12-172	115-200	78	158	54	72
Total income	\$1879	\$2018							\$1643	\$1774	\$1800	\$2400

^a For explanation of table headings, see pp. 136 and 138.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

SHELTER

The \$1,800 and \$2,400 budgets allow 20 per cent. for shelter. Under this heading should be included carfare to work, about \$30 a year for a person paying daily a single fare each way on the trolley. Thus a person living on \$2,400 could expend \$480, or \$40 monthly, for a house near his place of employment, but only \$37.50 if using the trolley, or only \$35 if spending 20 cents daily for transportation by train or trolley. Usually the properties distant from the center of the city are enough lower in rental price so that \$35 a month will secure a home quite as desirable as a central property at \$40.

OPERATION

As the principal item under this heading is wages, the percentage of income expended will vary widely according to whether a houseworker is regularly employed. In those cases in which this arrangement is made, 20 per cent. of the income will be necessary for operation; otherwise, 10 to 12 per cent. will suffice.

HEAT: The expenditure under this head will vary widely with different parts of the country, but as our studies are made in the latitude of Philadelphia, \$62 for ten tons at \$6.20, or \$75 for twelve tons at \$6.25, will be almost the minimum possible for comfort, where cooking is by coal range in winter. Note the bills for double that amount in some budgets.

LIGHT: A very variable item, according to whether the house is closely surrounded by other buildings and will, therefore, require the use of artificial light on cloudy days; whether oil, gas or electricity is used; whether

ANALYSIS OF FORTY BUDGETS

lights are kept burning in halls; the local price per thousand feet or kilowatts; whether gas is used for cooking and not differentiated from gas used for lighting. Thirty-six dollars allows \$2 for light per month and \$2 for gas for cooking for six months. If no gas is used for cooking, add \$12 to coal bill.

TELEPHONE: \$26 allows \$2 a month, the contract rate for party residence lines in Philadelphia, and \$2 a year for extras.

REFURNISHING: It is difficult to get accurate budget figures under this head, since a small amount of refurnishing may be done one year and a considerable amount another year. A reliable estimate, therefore, should consider expenses over at least ten years, or, better, over twenty, divided by ten (or twenty) for the annual average. Under this heading include purchase of new furniture and carpets to replace old, repairs to furniture, replacement of worn-out kitchen and dining-room equipment, and bed and table linen.

WAGES: \$194 allows wages of \$3.50 a week for a houseworker, or two days' assistance weekly of a laundress at \$1.75 per day, plus \$12 for a week's extra help at spring or fall housecleaning time; \$286 allows \$5.50 weekly for the entire year.

CLEANING MATERIALS: Includes equipment for cleaning and materials used.

ADVANCEMENT

The term "Higher Life" is used by some writers to include these expenditures for mental and physical education and recreation, social life and philanthropy. Ten per cent. of income is allowed under this heading in the

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

\$1,800 and \$2,400 budgets, and 5 per cent. for Sundries and Savings, a total of 15 per cent. But in the class budgets there is a remarkable uniformity of 25 to 26 per cent. for the expenditures under these three headings, since most of the budgets are of families who do not employ a houseworker.

HEALTH: The \$1,800 and \$2,400 budgets allow respectively for doctor \$6 and \$10; druggist, \$2 and \$3; dentist, \$5 and \$5; oculist, \$1 and \$2; toilet, \$4 and \$4; total, \$18 and \$24, or 1 per cent. of income.

RECREATION: Includes correspondence, summer vacation, travel, theatre, dances, dues of social clubs, playthings, and "spending money" used for candy, sodas, liquors, tobacco and other "personal indulgences" made in the search for pleasure, whether these are generally rated to be desirable or undesirable, a total of \$36 and \$48, or 2 per cent. of income.

EDUCATION: The allowances under the \$1,800 and \$2,400 budgets were respectively,—tuition and school supplies, \$30 and \$32; carfare to school, \$10 and \$20; dues of educational associations, \$3 and \$4; lectures, \$1 and \$3; daily paper, \$6 and \$6; magazines, \$2 and \$3; books, \$2 and \$4; total, \$54 and \$72, which is 3 per cent. of the income. If more money is required for tuition, \$50 can be taken out of "Beneficence," for "Charity begins at home!"

BENEFACTENCE:¹² \$72 and \$96 is 4 per cent. of the \$1,800 and \$2,400 budgets. For a family of five to expend 10 per cent. under this heading would require skimping

¹² A better word than "Benevolence," which is from Latin, bene, "well," and volens, "wishing," while Beneficence is from facere, "to do," and bene, "well." Many writers use heading "Charity."

ANALYSIS OF FORTY BUDGETS

all through the budget, unless the mother attempts to do practically all the housework. The expenditures are divided thus: $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of income, \$27 and \$36, for contributions to Church; 2 per cent., \$36 and \$48, to philanthropy, either as contributions or dues to various organizations for social welfare; $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., \$9 and \$12, for gifts to friends.

SUNDRIES AND SAVINGS: 5 per cent. of income is allowed for savings and sundries. The \$54 and \$72 savings will cover payments for life insurance, but not much at that. The Sundries heading includes the extras which are either unavoidable, or are luxuries occasionally indulged in over and above the usual allowance.

On an income of \$1,800 to \$2,400, therefore, a family of five, living in the city of Philadelphia, in the year 1915, would have found it difficult to save (beyond the small amounts required for life insurance payments or their equivalent put in the saving fund), unless they economized on some such desirable "comfort" as:

Reducing food expenditures by using meat substitutes or only the cheap cuts of meat, replacing butter with butterine, going without milk or an egg with the breakfast, or some other such economy.

Reducing clothing expenses by spending much time looking for and attending "special sales," or wearing clothing to a point requiring extra time for repairing, or dressing exceedingly "simply."

Reducing expense of shelter by living in a house less pretentious, or in a neighborhood less desirable, than one's friends in the same economic class.

Reducing the expense of operation, principally by running the household without the aid of a houseworker or having help only for a day or two weekly.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

Reducing or practically eliminating "advancement" by minimizing the expenditures for recreation, education or beneficence.

It will be a study of great interest for anyone, by referring to the tables given above, to ascertain amongst a group of normal families enjoying an income of \$1,800 or \$2,400, just which items each family chooses to omit or minimize. But, unfortunately, some persons prefer to have a deficit, rather than "skimp," trusting to an expected, or hoped-for, increase in future income to cover the overdraft.

SECTION II

THE REVISED HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

WE are now ready to take up the making of a budget based upon the total income. For this purpose we will take the \$1,800 and \$2,400 families and readjust their budgets so as to include the housewife's and houseworker's contribution. The total number of hours of household work given on p. 67 include the work of all members of the household group. Reference to the individual schedules shows that the most frequent time given for housewives alone (Query 3) for household work is about sixty-four hours per week, a nine-hour day, including Sunday. Multiplied by fifty weeks, the result is 3,150 hours in a year. Multiplying this by 30 cents per hour we get \$945, agreeing approximately with the estimate of the housewife's income on page 112.

The houseworker's hours are found to average about seventy per week, or 3,500 a year. The most frequent wage mentioned in the household schedules in reply to Query 18 ("What wages do you pay cook, general houseworker, etc.?") is \$5 per week. If we allow as much more for board, lodging and laundry, this gives \$500 as the annual income for fifty weeks, agreeing with the total arrived at on p. 107 (*supra*). Divided by 3,500 hours, the rate per hour is about 15 cents, which is the sum paid by half the families in the Maine inquiry (p. 106, *supra*).

Taking now the divisions of cash income of the \$1,800 family (p. 137, *supra*), since this income is not far from

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

the average of the forty budgets studied, and using three-fourths of the time given in the table on p. 67 (as sixty-four hours is about three-fourths of eighty-two), we get the following:

BUDGET OF FAMILY WITH \$1,800 INCOME

	Cash	%	Housewife's Services		Total	%
Food	\$540	30	27	hrs. at 30c x 50= \$405	\$945	35
Clothing	270	15	13.5	hrs. at 30c x 50= 202.50	472.50	17
Shelter	360	20	6.75	hrs. at 30c x 50= 101.25	461.25	17
Operation	360	20	2.25	hrs. at 30c x 50= 33.75 ¹³	393.75	14
Overtime			1.5	hrs. at 30c x 50= 22.50	22.50	1
Adv'cement & Sav'gs	270	15	12	hrs. at 30c x 50= 180 ¹⁴	450	16
	<u>\$1800</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>\$945</u>	<u>\$2745</u>	<u>100</u>

Next we will take the family having an income of \$2,400 and employing a houseworker. Reference to the household schedules shows that the divisions of time by housewife and houseworker in this family were as follows:

¹³ Management.

¹⁴ Care of children.

THE REVISED HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

BUDGET OF FAMILY WITH \$2,400 INCOME

	Cash	%	Housewife's Services	Houseworker's Services	Total	%	
Food	\$720	30	7 hrs. at 30c x 50 = \$105	39 hrs. at 15c x 50 = \$292.50	\$1117.50	31	
Clothing	360	15	13 hrs. at 30c x 50 = 195	9 hrs. at 15c x 50 = 67.50	622.50	17	
Shelter	480	20	7 hrs. at 30c x 50 = 105	17 hrs. at 15c x 50 = 127.50	712.50	20	
Operat'n \$230							
Wages	250 ¹¹	480	20	4 hrs. at 30c x 50 = 60	1 hr. at 15c x 50 = 7.50 ¹²	297.50	8
Advancement							
& Savings	360	15	32 hrs. at 30c x 50 = 480	4 hrs. at 15c x 50 = 30	870	24	
	\$2400	100	63	\$945	70	\$525 ¹¹	
						\$3620	100
						25 ¹¹	
						\$3595	

¹¹ The wages entry is not carried across to be added to the \$297.50 for operation, because the \$250 is included in the payments for houseworker's services at 15 cents per hour.

¹² Management. The houseworker spends, on the average, one hour a week in consultation with the housewife.

¹³ Total is \$25 over \$500 wages for houseworker, as exact rate per hour would be 14.28 cents.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

It is interesting to note the changes in the percentages of expense that take place when the cost of the productive activities in the home are included in the budget. The total includes the husband's salary, the wife's income, and \$250 received from the houseworker for her board, lodging and laundry.

Comparing the percentages of expenditure in the final columns of these two tables, we find that although the amount spent for food by the family having a \$2,400 income is much greater than that of the family having only an \$1,800 income, yet the percentage is smaller. The greatest increase in percentage of outlay in the \$2,400 budget is under "Advancement," which includes the care of children. Next to this is the increase in the comparative outlay for "Shelter," which includes house-cleaning.

In order to show the relation between the household budget and those of other business concerns, we will next re-arrange our \$3,595 budget under the headings of the "Expenses of Production."¹⁸

¹⁸ Seager, "Principles of Economics," p. 173.

THE REVISED HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

HOUSEHOLD EXPENSES

Raw materials:		
Food	\$720	
Clothing	5	
	<u> </u>	\$725
Replacement fund:		
Clothing	\$355	
Repairs "	10	
Furniture	15	
Utensils	10	
Linen	8	
Insurance "	2	
	<u> </u>	400
Rent		480
Taxes "		12
Interest "		48
(4% on \$1200)		
Operation:		
Heat, light and 'phone	\$125	
Materials	12	
Gas, cooking	12	
Sundries	48	
Advancement	240	
	<u> </u>	437
Wages:		
Housewife	\$500	
Houseworker		
Cash	250	
In "kind"	250	
Extra help	36	
	<u> </u>	1036
Wages of management:		
Housewife		445
Profits:		
Housewife	+\$255	
Husband	— 255	
	<u> </u>	0
		\$3583
Savings		72
	<u> </u>	\$3655

HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Husband		
Salary	\$2400	
Loss	255	
	<u> </u>	\$2145
Wife		
Salary	\$945	
Profits	255	
	<u> </u>	\$1200
From houseworker's board and lodging		250
From rent of furniture and equipment to family		60

" On furniture only. If house is owned, the expenditures for taxes, interest and repairs thereon would be made under rent heading.

" This total exceeds that in the preceding table by \$60, due to the inclusion of the income from rent of furniture and equipment.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

In treating of the expenses of production it is desirable to determine first what is being produced. The product aimed at by the expenditure of the family income is a healthy, educated, well-fed, clothed, housed and happy family, living in a manner to continue these conditions not only for a lifetime, but also from generation to generation.

First, we must consider the **CAPITAL** invested in the business. The establishment of the business occurs when the firm is formed at the end of the wedding trip, that is, when the housewife begins work. The capital will be all the financial resources which are being drawn upon to obtain the product mentioned in the preceding paragraph. A statement of the capital goods²¹ invested would include the house and land, if owned, and all the furniture and furnishings of the house.

RAW MATERIALS include all food, whether requiring cooking or not, as practically all food must be properly served before it is ready for consumption. Materials purchased to make into clothing at home are included here.

REPLACEMENT FUND includes clothing, repairs to furniture, furniture and equipment to replace that broken, etc. If more valuable furniture is procured to replace that worn out, the difference should be credited to capital invested; the same rule would apply to linen and utensils. If the house is owned, a sinking fund of, say, 2 per cent. should be charged under rent. Fire insurance is also a form of replacement.

²¹ Economists distinguish between capital, the money which is set aside to be used for producing more wealth, and capital goods, which are the instruments of production purchased with such capital.

THE REVISED HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

RENT is a term generally applied to money paid for use of a house and land. In economics the two are separated; the money paid for the use of land is rent, that paid for the use of the house is interest on capital invested in its construction.

TAXES are said to be paid by the owner of the house. They are, but if the house is rented, the owner passes on the tax by including it in the rental of the property, so the final taxpayer is the occupier of the residence, whether owner or not. The taxes and interest charged here are for the rental of the furniture to the family.

OPERATION includes sundries, because in any business its successful operation requires a reserve fund for emergencies. It also includes Advancement.

WAGES include not only cash paid to the houseworker, but wages paid "in kind." The income of the housewife is that ascertained to be her income when her work is valued at 30 cents an hour.

WAGES OF MANAGEMENT is the term applied to the salary of the manager of a business. As it is difficult to value this factor accurately without intimate knowledge of each housewife's capabilities, the estimate of \$445 is the difference between the income of the average houseworker and the average housewife of this group (p. 155, supra).

PROFITS may be charged against the housewife or against the husband, according to the respective ability of each. In very few cases would they be so evenly matched as to yield no profits on one side or the other. The housewife receives the same income as the husband if they share evenly. But that does not necessarily mean that she *earns* the same sum as does her husband. As

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

we have rated the value of her services at \$945 (p. 155) and she gets one-half of her husband's salary, or \$1,200, her "profits" will be \$255. As his "loss" will be just \$255, the "profit and loss" account of this co-operative partnership will be 0! What is entered in the income account of the household as \$255 profit to the housewife might be entered in the *family* budget as an equivalent exchange for charm. (See p. 100, supra.)

In industry, profits are not considered an expense of production from the standpoint of the entrepreneur (the enterpriser, or man who runs the business), but profits are rather considered what is left over after all the expenses have been paid; they may be considered as a fair return for risk assumed, or as arising from changes in business conditions.²² From the standpoint of society, however, profits should be considered an expense of production, since they enter in as a part of the expense because few men will undertake production except with the expectation of making profits, and if they do not make them, will retire from business if possible.

In the household, also, profit is a part of the expense of production. For the husband gives to his wife what he considers she is worth,²³ and this includes wages for her work and profits. If, then, we say that the value of the wife is to be reckoned by what her husband gives her for a living,—the view of Prof. S. N. Patten of the University of Pennsylvania,—we have the argument given on p. 98. But on p. 100 it was pointed out that

²² Seager, "Principles of Economics," page 198.

²³ In the above calculations assumed to be one-half husband's income but in actual practice more or less than this equal dividing up is likely to occur.

THE REVISED HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

what the husband gives his wife covers not only her services as housewife, but her personal qualities as wife.²⁴

Not only does the budget need to be revised to include the time spent in housework and the skill of that work, but the entries under Operation and Sundries should be re-arranged. What we desire to know through the study of the budget, is the total expense of feeding the family, not of food as a raw material; the expense of shelter, not merely the rental price of an empty house.

The budget of a family in which the husband has an income of \$2,400, thus revised, will be as follows:

A SCIENTIFIC HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

FOOD

Meat and fish, eggs, butter, milk, bread, cereals, vegetables, fruits, beverages, sweets and condiments, ice, sundries, meals purchased		\$720.00	
Meals purchased		12.00	
			\$732.00
Rent, or equivalent, $\frac{1}{4}$ of \$450.....			112.50
Furniture and equipment:			
Interest, $\frac{1}{4}$ of \$60.....		\$15.00	
Insurance, $\frac{1}{4}$ of \$2.....		.50	
Repairs, $\frac{1}{4}$ of \$10.....		2.50	
Replacement fund:			
New furniture, $\frac{1}{4}$ of \$15...		\$3.75	
Utensils		10.00	
Linen, table and kitchen ...		3.00	
Gardening tools		3.00	
		19.75	
			37.75
Heat, $\frac{1}{7}$ of \$50		\$7.15	
Range coal		25.00	
Gas		12.00	
			44.15

²⁴ His personal qualities also are a factor in determining the amount his wife receives. Given two men of equal income, equally admiring their wives' abilities, one having an open-handed disposition will be likely to give more freely than a husband naturally close-fisted.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

Light, $\frac{1}{4}$ of \$24	\$6.00	
Cleaning materials, $\frac{1}{4}$ of 8	2.00	
Wages:		
Housewife	\$105.00	
Housewife, management	17.00	
Houseworker	292.50	
Extra assistance	6.00	
Gardening	12.00	
	<hr/>	\$432.50
Telephone, 1/5 of \$24	4.80	
	<hr/>	\$1,371.70
Houseworker's board	162.50	
	<hr/>	\$1,209.20

CLOTHING

Overcoats, suits, shirts, underwear, nightshirts, hosiery, shoes, overshoes, hats, umbrellas, gloves, handkerchiefs, collars and cuffs, neckties, sundries, laundry, coats and furs, dresses, waists, skirts and petticoats.		
Husband	\$108.00	
Wife	126.00	
Children	126.00	
	<hr/>	\$360.00
Wages:		
Housewife	\$195.00	
Housewife, management	33.50	
Houseworker	67.50	
Extra assistance	6.00	
	<hr/>	302.00
Laundry materials	4.00	
	<hr/>	\$666.00
Houseworker's laundry	25.00	
	<hr/>	\$641.00

SHELTER

Rent, $\frac{3}{4}$ of \$450	\$337.50	
(Or $\frac{3}{4}$ of:		
Taxes, water rent, interest on value of house, insurance on house, repairs to house)		
Carfare to business	30.00	
	<hr/>	\$367.50
Furniture and furnishings:		
Interest, $\frac{3}{4}$ of \$60	\$45.00	
Insurance, $\frac{3}{4}$ of \$2	1.50	
Repairs, $\frac{3}{4}$ of \$10	7.50	

THE REVISED HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

Replacement fund:

New furniture, $\frac{3}{4}$ of \$15...	\$11.25
Bed linen and towels	5.00
	<u>\$16.25</u>

Heat, $\frac{6}{7}$ of \$50	\$70.25
Light, $\frac{3}{4}$ of \$24	42.85
Cleaning materials, $\frac{3}{4}$ of \$8	18.00
	6.00

Wages:

Housewife	\$105.00
Housewife, management	17.00
Houseworker	127.50
Extra assistance	9.00
Care of grounds and flower garden..	8.00
	<u>\$266.50</u>

Lodging	8.00
---------------	------

	<u>\$779.10</u>
Houseworker's lodging	62.50

\$716.60

ADVANCEMENT

(Higher Life)

Health (Physical):

Doctor	\$10.00
Druggist	3.00
Dentist	5.00
Oculist	2.00
Toilet	4.00

Athletics:

Dues	\$4.00
Equipment	4.00
	<u>8.00</u>

Insurance	12.00
	<u>\$44.00</u>

Education (Mental):

Tuition and school supplies	\$32.00
Carfare to school	20.00
Lectures	3.00
Books	4.00
Magazines and daily paper	9.00
Dues of educational associations.....	4.00
	<u>\$72.00</u>

Recreation (Social):

Theatre, motion pictures	\$8.00
Entertainments:	
Concerts, parties, dances and dues	
of social clubs	6.00

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

Playthings	\$4.00	
Travel:		
Train, trolley and automobile	12.00	
Correspondence	8.00	
Telephone	21.20	
Spending money	10.00	
		<u>\$69.20</u>
Beneficence (Ethical):		
Church	\$36.00	
Philanthropy:		
Contributions	\$28.00	
Dues	22.00	
		<u>50.00</u>
Gifts to friends	10.00	
		<u>96.00</u>
		<u>\$281.20</u>
Children—Care, oversight, entertaining:		
Wages:		
Houseworker	\$30.00	
Housewife	480.00	
		<u>\$510.00</u>
		<u>\$791.20</u>
		<u>\$3,358.00</u>
Overcharge, see page 157, footnote....		<u>25.00</u>
		<u>\$3,333.00</u>
Savings		<u>72.00</u>
		<u>\$3,405.00</u>

FOOD

MEALS PURCHASED: Under this heading, in table on p. 139, entry was made for daily lunches. Add here board at summer hotel and other extra meals. (This \$12 is taken from the allowance made in budget on p. 149 for summer vacation, entered under Recreation, p. 152.)

RENT: One-fourth of the rent is charged against food, because two out of eight rooms are used for preparation and serving of food. If the family lives in a ten-room house, the fraction would be one-fifth. One might argue

THE REVISED HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

that the dining-room is a place where one is sheltered while consuming food. But it is desirable to be able to ascertain from the budget what is the total expense of food prepared in the home compared with what would be the expense of going out to meals. If one rents an apartment of six rooms, without dining-room and kitchen, the expense would be less than for an eight-room apartment or house. The same principle applies to the division of expenses for furniture.

HEAT: Only one-seventh of the coal consumed in the furnace is charged against food, because the kitchen is heated as a by-product of the heat generated by the range, which is primarily used for cooking, leaving seven rooms to be heated from the furnace, of which number the dining-room is one.

WAGES: Divide expenses under this heading according to division of time given in table on p. 157.

MANAGEMENT: The \$67.50 in table on p. 157 is divided between food, clothing and shelter, in proportion to the time the housewife gives to activities in these lines. (The houseworker's share is so small it has been merged with the housewife's.)

EXTRA ASSISTANCE: Either to pay an extra helper brought in, or to cover payments to houseworker for overtime.

GARDENING: If the husband raises vegetables for the table, time spent in that occupation should be entered here; time of the housewife spent in raising flowers would be entered under Shelter.

TELEPHONE: The percentage charged here will depend upon the amount of marketing done by 'phone in comparison with its use for other purposes.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

CLOTHING

If a sewing room is provided in the house, make entries for rent, furniture, etc., the same as under Food. If sewing is done in living rooms, consider their use for mending or manufacture of clothing as adding nothing to budget expenditures, but rather as a by-product of shelter. To be accurate there should be a small entry for light used while sewing, and for the cost and care of a sewing-machine.

SHELTER

INTEREST: If there is a mortgage on the house, enter here annual payments thereon, deduct amount of mortgage from estimated value of house, and charge current interest rate on balance.

LODGING: Charges for room at summer hotel or on other pleasure trips.

ADVANCEMENT

INSURANCE: Entries here are for a sinking fund to meet expenses of births, deaths, accidents and severe illnesses.

TRAVEL: In this budget "summer vacation" expenses are not entered in a lump sum, but board was given under Food, lodging under Shelter, and carfare here. The amount allowed in this budget will not be enough to cover automobile expenses. If a person with a salary of \$2,400 indulges in a machine, funds for its maintenance must be found by reducing some other expenditure.

TELEPHONE: Some budget-makers enter telephone charges under Shelter, as a part of the equipment of the house. An exactly detailed budget would divide up

THE REVISED HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

expenditures for telephone and carfare under each heading, according to the purpose for which the telephone is used or a trip on the cars is taken. The expenditures are given as one sum here (except use of 'phone for food purchase) to simplify account-keeping, and because in the case of the use of the trolley very often one trip combines several objects, such as the purchase of clothing, a visit to the dentist and attendance at the theatre.

SPENDING MONEY: Covers such personal indulgences as candy, sodas, tobacco, liquors, etc. They are entered under Recreation because they are indulged in with the idea of obtaining pleasure, though their use may not contribute to Advancement! As noted above, liquors served with meals are entered under Food, whether dietetically valuable or valueless.

SUMMARY

Through this final readjustment of the budget, to include the services of the housewife and her assistants and to eliminate the headings of Operation and Sundries, we are enabled to ascertain the actual divisions of the expenses in a family where there are three children, the husband has a \$2,400 income and a houseworker is employed. The percentages are: Food, 35 per cent.; Clothing, 19 per cent.; Shelter, 21 per cent.; Advancement, 23 per cent.; Savings, 2 per cent. Approximately this will be: Food, one-third; Clothing, one-fifth; Shelter, one-fifth; Advancement, one-quarter.

SECTION III

TOTAL FAMILY INCOME

WE are now prepared to estimate the total family income where the home is owned. The rental value of the property should be added to husband's and wife's income, which in this case would be \$3,345 plus \$480 (10 per cent. on a property valued at \$4,800). To this must be added the rental value of the furniture and equipment (10 per cent. on \$1,200), amounting to \$120. Then add the amount received for the rental of the house-worker's room (heated and lighted), her food (not only the cost of the food consumed, but its preparation in the time paid for by her employer), and her laundry, a total of \$5 weekly, or \$250 for fifty weeks. The three children, who are below the "working" age, are, however, able to contribute somewhat to the family income, and if the oldest does two hours' work each week-day, valued at twelve cents, and the second child an hour's work valued at ten cents, a total of \$2 weekly, or \$104 a year, will be added to the family income. This much they might be taught to do to contribute toward their "bread and butter." Work more than this might be paid for.

Furthermore, we must not overlook the family income from social durable consumption goods, such as the free use of public schools, libraries, parks, streets, lighting, sanitation, health and police protection, which, if paid for at commercial rates, in a large city like Philadelphia might be roughly estimated at not less than ten times the cost of taxation (\$48, \$1 on each \$100 worth of property), or \$480. Add \$21 as a possible cash value of

TOTAL FAMILY INCOME

gifts received annually. This gives a grand total of \$4,800 annual income, which far more accurately represents the actual degree of comfortable living of the family than the crude statement of the husband's salary as representing the family income. This may be summarized thus:

Husband's salary	\$2,400.00
Wife's salary	945.00
Rental of house to family	480.00
Rental of furniture and equipment to family	120.00
Board and lodging of houseworker	250.00
Children's assistance	104.00
Benefits from social durable consumption goods.....	480.00
Gifts	21.00
	<hr/>
	\$4,800.00

CHAPTER VII
THE ECONOMISTS AND HOUSEHOLD
PRODUCTIVE ACTIVITIES

THE ECONOMISTS AND HOUSEHOLD PRODUCTIVE ACTIVITIES

IF household work is productive labor, and if the total amount of its value compares favorably with the output of industrial activities in factories and on farms, then one would expect to find considerable recognition of this fact in the writings of the economists. A brief survey of the works of many of the best known writers leads to the conclusion that heretofore this field of economic activity has not been given the prominence which its importance warrants.¹ In Ravenhill and Schiff's "Household Administration" the assertion is made that (p. 123) "The household has been treated by economists with curious negligence"; and (p. 130) "The work accomplished by the wife in the household has never yet received its full acknowledgment from the economists."

¹ Possibly this is due to the fact that economists have nearly all been males, an illustration, therefore, of what Mrs. Gilman has indicated in the title of her book, "The Man-Made World; Our Androcentric Culture."

SECTION I

XENOPHON

THE earliest noteworthy treatise on household activities is by Xenophon; he is the author of "The *Oeconomicus*; A Treatise on the Management of a Farm and Household."² This work was written in the fourth century before Christ. The argument is in the form of a discussion between Socrates, the famous philosopher, and Critobulus.

The treatise opens with a definition of economics as "household management," using the word house (*oikos*) in the sense of "estate"; "everything that a person has is comprehended under this term." (Chap. 1, par. 1-5.)

The main purpose of this treatise is to show that the husband not only directs the farm, but is the real head of the house in that he is expected to instruct his wife in household management and is therefore responsible if his household is poorly managed. Socrates says: "I can also show that some men have so managed their wives, as to find in them fellow-helpers in improving their fortunes, whilst others have dealt with them in such a way that they have in a great degree ruined them." "But in these cases, my dear Socrates, ought we to blame the husband or the wife?" "If a sheep," replied Socrates, "is in ill condition, we generally blame the shepherd; if a horse is mischievous, we impute the fault to the groom; and as to a wife, if, after being taught what is right,

² Translated by Rev. J. S. Watson, in Bohn's Classical Library, 1905 edition.

XENOPHON

she conducts herself badly, perhaps she ought justly to bear the blame; but if her husband does not teach her what is right and proper, but exacts service from her while she is ignorant of what she ought to do, would he not justly be visited with condemnation? But by all means tell us the truth, Critobulus, is there anyone to whom you intrust a greater number of important affairs than to your wife?" "There is no one," replied Critobulus. "And is there anyone with whom you hold fewer discussions than with your wife?" "If there is anyone, there are certainly not many." "Did you marry her when she was quite young, or, at least, when she had seen and heard as little of things as was well possible?" "Certainly I did." . . . "But I consider that a wife, who is a good partner in household management, has equal influence with her husband for their common prosperity. Resources come into the house for the most part by the exertions of the husband, but the larger portion of them is expended under the management of the wife, and, if affairs be well ordered, the estate is improved; but if they are conducted badly, the property is diminished." (Chap. 3, par. 10-15.)

Socrates then tells Critobulus that as he is not learned in economics he will narrate a conversation he had with Ischomachus, who had the reputation of being an excellent householder. Socrates says: "I would very gladly be permitted to ask you, Ischomachus, whether you instructed your wife yourself, so that she might be qualified as she ought to be, or whether, when you received her from her father and mother, she was possessed of sufficient knowledge to manage what belongs to her?" "And how, my dear Socrates," said he, "could she have had sufficient knowledge when I took her, since she came to my house when she was not fifteen years old, and had

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

spent the preceding part of her life under the strictest restraint, in order that she might see as little, hear as little, and ask as few questions as possible?" (Chap. 7, par. 4-5.) Ischomachus then begins the instruction of his wife. That the idea that woman's place is in the home is not a modern one is shown by the following paragraphs: "The gods have plainly adapted the nature of the woman for works and duties within doors and that of the man for works and duties without doors." (Par. 22.) "For it is more becoming for the woman to stay within doors than to roam abroad, but to the man it is less creditable to remain at home than to attend to things out of doors." (Par. 30.)

Housewifery is recognized as involving both skill and pleasure. "Some of your occupations, my dear wife," continued Ischomachus, "will be pleasing to you. For instance, when you take a young woman who does not know how to spin, and make her skillful at it, and she thus becomes of twice as much value to you. Or when you take one who is ignorant of the duties of a house-keeper or servant, and, having made her accomplished, trustworthy and handy, render her of the highest value." (Par. 41.)

The next chapter is a dissertation on the importance and beauty of order in a house. That the Greek love of beauty should appear in the management of the household is characteristic. "But how beautiful an appearance it has when shoes, for instance, of whatever kind they are, are arranged in order; how beautiful it is to see garments, of whatever kind, deposited in their several places; how beautiful it is to see bed-clothes, and brazen vessels, and table furniture, so arranged; and (what, most of all, a person might laugh at, not indeed a grave person, but a jester), I say, that pots have a graceful appearance

XENOPHON

when they are placed in regular order. Other articles somehow appear, too, when regularly arranged, more beautiful in consequence; for the several sorts of vessels seem like so many choral bands; and the space that is between them pleases the eye, when every sort of vessel is set clear of it; just as a body of singers and dancers, moving in a circle, is not only in itself a beautiful sight, but the space in the middle of it, being open and clear, is agreeable to the eye." (Chap. 8, par. 19-20.)

His wife then asks Ischomachus to arrange the various articles as he thinks best, and he proceeds: "Thus the inner chamber, being in a secure part of the house, calls for the most valuable couch-coverings and vessels; the dry parts of the building for the corn; the cool places for the wine; and the well-lighted portions for such articles of workmanship, and vases, as require a clear light." (Chap. 9, par. 3.) "We then proceeded to classify our goods. . . . Of utensils there were distinct collections, one of instruments for spinning, another of those for preparing corn, another of those for cooking, another of those for the bath, another of those for kneading bread, another of those for the table. . . . Of the housekeeper we made choice after considering which of the female servants appeared to have most self-restraint in eating, and wine, and sleep, and converse with the male sex; and, in addition to this, which seemed to have the best memory, and which appeared to have forethought, that she might not incur punishment from us for neglect, and to consider how, by gratifying us, she might gain some mark of approbation in return." (Par. 6-11.)

That Dame Fashion, with all her vagaries, is an ancient dame, is entertainingly shown in the next chapter on admonitions as to dress. Ischomachus says of his wife:

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

"Seeing her one day, Socrates, painted over with a great deal of white lead, that she might appear still fairer than she really was, and with a great deal of vermilion, that her complexion might seem more rosy than its natural hue, and having on high-heeled shoes, that she might seem tall beyond her real stature, 'Tell me,' said I, 'my dear wife, whether you would consider me, as a sharer of my fortunes with you, more worthy of your love, if I should show you what I really possessed, and should neither boast that I have more than really belongs to me, nor conceal any portion of what I have; or if, on the contrary, I should endeavor to deceive you by saying that I have more than is really mine, and by showing you counterfeit money, and necklaces of gilt wood, and purple garments of a fading colour, pretending that they are of the true quality?' She, instantly replying, said, 'Hush! may you never act in such a way; for if you were to do so, I could never love you from my heart.' . . . 'Consider accordingly that I also, my dear wife, am not better pleased with the colour of white lead and red dye than with your own; but as the gods have made horses the most beautiful objects of contemplation to horses, oxen to oxen, and sheep to sheep, so men think that the body in its natural state is the most agreeable object of contemplation to men.'" His wife then, he says, "asked me if I could recommend her any course by which she might render herself really good-looking, and not merely make herself be thought so. . . . I told her that it would be good exercise to wet and knead the bread, and to shake out and put up the clothes and bed-coverings. I assured her that if she thus exercised herself she would take her food with a better appetite, would enjoy better health, and would assume a more truly excellent complexion." "And now, Socrates,"

XENOPHON

added he, "my wife regulates her conduct, be assured, as I taught her." (Chap. 10, par. 2-13.)

The remaining half of the "Œconomicus" is devoted to a discussion of the work outside of the house, that is, to the management of the farm.

SECTION II

ALBERTI

A FIFTEENTH CENTURY FOLLOWER OF XENOPHON

AN interesting work based on Xenophon's "Economicus" appeared about 1444 and is variously ascribed to Leo(n) Battista Alberti and to Agnolo Pandolfini. Without going into the controversy as to which of these two Italians is the author of the original work and which the plagiarist, we will quote from J. A. Symonds' "The Renaissance in Italy" a brief paragraph concerning each writer.

"Alberti was the greatest writer of Italian prose in the fifteenth century. He exercised an influence over the spirit of his age and race second only to Lionardo (Leonardo da Vinci). His principal prose work (the 'Trattato')^{*} was written to instruct the members of his family in the customs of their ancestors and to perpetuate those virtues of domestic life which he regarded as the sound foundation of a commonwealth. The first book establishes the principles of domestic morality on which a family exists and flourishes. The second provides for its propagation through marriage. The third shows how its resources are to be distributed and preserved."

In "The Age of Despots" (1897 Ed., p. 190), Symonds says, "In the bourgeois household described by Pandolfini no one can be indolent. The character of a good housewife is sketched very minutely. The children's

^{*} It was republished in the last century and used in Italian schools as a text-book in reading.

ALBERTI

dress, the boys' pocket money, the food of the common table are all described with some minuteness." He quotes: "In order to be successful in the conduct of the family, a man must choose a large and healthy house, where the whole of his offspring, children and grandchildren, may live together. He must own an estate. The main food of the family will be bread and wine. In order to meet expenses, some trade must be followed, silk or wool manufacture being preferred; and in this the whole family should join, the head distributing work of various kinds to his children, as he deems most fitting, and always employing them rather than strangers."

In reading these books one is struck with the very close resemblance to the "Œconomicus" of Xenophon. But it never occurred to the writer to state that he was quoting from his master, for in that epoch it was customary for artist and author to draw material from any source without acknowledgment. The author, however, is less democratic and more patriarchal than his model, thereby reflecting the difference in spirit of the Greek life and that of the Middle Ages.

Let us get acquainted with the language of the author.⁴ "Conosco prima, figliulo miei, in questa mia maggiore età fatto più prudente, la masserizia esser cosa utilissima, e chi gitta via il suo esser matto." "I know, first of all, my sons, in this my advanced age made wiser, the care of the household (footnote by Italian editor, 'la masserizia = il risparmio, "thrift"; or 'la savia economia,' "wise economy") to be the thing most useful, and who throws away (wastes) his own (what he has) is mad."

⁴Quotations are from the text of Pandolfini and the translation is literal rather than literary.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

This is the keynote of the book. In its perusal one is many times strongly impressed with the feeling that the American idea that the European is especially noted for thriftiness has its basis in a trait of ancient lineage. To us it seems that the worthy writer carries this virtue to an extreme which would make life in his household rather exacting as regards the partner of his joys.

The next quotation is, of all ideas expressed in the book, perhaps the most literally copied from Xenophon. "When my wife, your mother, had been living for a few days in the house and had become settled and interest in the house commenced to delight her, I took her by the hand and showed her the whole house and pointed out to her that up above was the place for grains and down below the room for wine and wood, and I showed her where one puts everything necessary for the house, and there was not any furnishing in the house that she did not see where best it should be put and which she did not learn from me what it was used for." This, it must be remembered, is the picture of an establishment maintained by the upper classes, in which the woman's work was principally management, for "Many things it would be unbecoming for you to do, there being others to do them," says her lord. And again, "I do not wish that you should be one who does everything." "It is fitting for you in the more humble things to command."

There is a modern touch in the magnanimous statement that, "All these goods of ours, this household, the sons born and which will be born are ours, yours as well as mine, and, therefore, it is necessary for us to do our duty and preserve that which belongs to one and to the other (both of us together). Therefore, I will procure abroad that which you have need of in the house and you will look to it that all is arranged properly and made

ALBERTI

good use of." One might glean from these statements an apparent recognition of the equality of woman in the home, but elsewhere in the book the author shows in unmistakable terms, that he considers himself the supreme ruler, even in minor household details. The book is written in the form of conversations which the father is having with his sons, and he says approvingly of his wife, "Then she answered me with humility and modesty and said, that her mother had taught her to spin and to sew and now she was learning from me and would learn how to manage a household." Evidently, a young bride fresh from her mother's sheltering care cannot be expected to know how to arrange and order a household until duly instructed by her husband!

Mark this delicious picture of Italian life: "It is becoming for you not to sit all day long with your elbows on the window, as do certain idle gossips, who all day hold their sewing in their hand, which they never finish. Above all things, flee laziness and always busy yourself at something and see to it that others busy themselves also, because this activity will be of great benefit to the management of the household, and will be very useful to you, because then you will dine with better appetite, you will be healthier for it, a better color, fresh and beautiful, and the house will be better regulated and they (servants) will not be able to squander the goods." Even the picture of his wife's enhanced loveliness through household exercise failed to entice this worthy gentleman from the insistence upon thrift!

But there was a servant problem in the middle ages—of course. "When servants are not in fear of being watched and have not one who overlooks and corrects them, then they throw away (even) more than they

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

waste." "It is necessary to put each thing in the place best for preserving and keeping it, as grain in a fresh place open to the north; wine in a place where there is neither cold nor too much heat nor wind nor any bad odor. They should often be looked at so that if by chance they begin to rot or spoil, immediately one can remedy it, either by using them before they are made absolutely useless or in a way that all is not lost."

Apparently, the man was the buyer in those patriarchal days, when, no doubt, he purchased goods in considerable quantities for his large household, for after telling his wife to ascertain "how much and for what there must be provision made," "immediately," he says, "you will tell me before it is lacking altogether, so that I may get it abroad better and at less expense. What is bought in haste is most often badly seasoned, dirty, spoils quickly and costs more and thus one throws away as much or more than one wastes of it." That it pays to buy the best is also a piece of household wisdom, which this shrewd patrician understood. "If you use strong wine and spoiled salt meats, or anything else not good for feeding the household, no one will bother to be saving of it; it is thrown out, poured out, no one cares about it; each one is vexed about it and they do thus—they write this down as a sign of avarice. . . . But if you have good wine, best bread and other things suitable, the household is well content and joyous and serves you with good will, and the steward uses thrift with good things; with bad things, together with the other servants, he feels himself aggrieved. . . . Good things always last better than poor things. Look at this tunic of mine.

ALBERTI

I have already used it many, many years. I was well dressed in it for many years at the festivals, and now it is still not unbecoming for everyday wear. If I then had not chosen the best Florentine cloth I would since have had two others made, nor would I be as well dressed as in this."

SECTION III

ADAM SMITH

ADAM SMITH is generally recognized as the "Father of Modern Political Economy." His great work, "The Wealth of Nations," appeared in England in 1776. In this "Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations," the author makes an interesting distinction in kinds of labor as judged by the products. "There is one sort of labor which adds to the value of the subject upon which it is bestowed; there is another which has no such effect. The former, as it produces a value, may be called productive, the latter, unproductive labor." "The labor of a menial servant⁵ adds to the value of nothing." "The maintenance of a menial servant never is restored. A man grows rich by employing a multitude of manufacturers; he grows poor by maintaining a multitude of servants. The labor of the latter, however, has its value, and deserves its reward as well as the former. But the labor of the manufacturer fixes and realizes itself in some particular subject or vendible commodity, which lasts for some time, at least, after that labor is past. It is, as it were, a certain quantity of labor stocked and stored up to be employed, if necessary, upon some other occasion. That subject, or what is the same thing, the price of that subject, can afterwards, if necessary, put into motion a quantity of labor equal to that which

⁵ The word menial signified at first, "attached to a household." Later the idea of servility crept in. It is used to designate domestics.

ADAM SMITH

had originally produced it. The labor of the menial servant, on the contrary, does not fix or realize itself in any particular subject or vendible commodity. His services generally perish in the very instant of their performance, and seldom leave any trace of value behind them, for which an equal quantity of service could afterwards be procured. The labor of some of the most respectable orders in the society is, like that of menial servants, unproductive of any value, such as that of the sovereign, officers of justice and war, churchmen, lawyers, musicians, dancers, etc.”⁶ This distinction between productive and unproductive labor has been abandoned by economists, who include in wealth, services, as well as commodities.⁷

⁶ Smith, “Wealth of Nations” (Cannan Ed.), 1904, Vol. I, Bk. II, Chapter III.

⁷ See page 17, *supra*.

SECTION IV

MCCULLOCH

IN "The Principles of Political Economy" (1825), J. R. McCulloch takes in regard to servants exactly the position which is taken in regard to the housewife, in Dr. Devine's recent treatise on "The Economic Function of Women." He quotes from Adam Smith: "The labor of a menial servant . . . adds to the value of nothing" and so is *unproductive* labor, even though such services are "often of the highest utility," but "these services, however useful, do not augment the *wealth* of the country; and, consequently, that the commodities consumed by this class are unproductively consumed, and have a tendency to impoverish, not to enrich, the society."⁸ Commenting on this McCulloch says: "Dr. Smith says that a menial servant's labor is unproductive, because it is not realized in a vendible commodity, while the labor of the manufacturer is productive, because it is so realized. But of what is the labor of the manufacturer really productive? Does it not consist exclusively of the comforts and conveniences required for the use and accommodation of society? The manufacturer is not a producer of matter, but of *utility* only. And is it not obvious that the labor of the menial servant is also productive of utility? It is universally allowed, that the labor of the husbandman who raises corn, beef and other articles of provision is productive; but if so, why is the labor of the menial servant who performs the *necessary* and *in-*

⁸ "Wealth of Nations," Cannan Edition, 1904, page 313.

McCULLOCH

dispensable task of preparing and dressing these articles, and fitting them to be used, to be set down as unproductive? It is clear to demonstration, that there is no difference whatever between the two species of industry—that they are either both productive, or both unproductive. To produce a fire, it is just as necessary that coals should be carried from the cellar to the grate, as that they should be carried from the bottom of the mine to the surface of the earth; and if it is said that the miner is a productive laborer, must we not also say the same of the servant, who is employed to make and mend the fire? The whole of Dr. Smith's reasoning proceeds on a false hypothesis. He has made a distinction where there is none, and where it is not in the nature of things, there can be any. The end of all human exertion is the same—that is, to increase the sum of necessities, comforts and enjoyments; and it must be left to the judgment of everyone to determine what proportion of these comforts he will have in the shape of menial services, and what in the shape of material products. It is true, as has been sometimes stated, that the results of the labor of the menial servant are seldom capable of being estimated in the same way as the results of the agriculturist, manufacturer, or merchant; but they are not, on that account, the less real or valuable. Could the same quantity of work be performed by those who are called productive laborers, were it not for the assistance they derive from those who are falsely called unproductive? A merchant or banker who is making £5,000 or £10,000 a year by his business may perhaps be expending £1,000 on his servants; now it is plain, that if he tries to save this sum, he can do so only by turning his servants adrift, and becoming a coachman, footman and washerwoman for himself; and, if he does this, he

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

will, instead of making £5,000 or £10,000 a year, be most probably unable to make even £50! No doubt a man will be ruined if he keeps more servants than he has occasion for, or than he can afford to pay; but his ruin would be equally certain were he to purchase an excess of food or clothes, or to employ more workmen in any branch of manufacture, than are required to carry it on or than his capital could employ. To keep two ploughmen, when one only might suffice, is just as improvident and wasteful expenditure as it is to keep two footmen to do the business of one. It is in the extravagant quantity of the commodities we consume, or of the labor we employ, and not in the particular species of commodities or labor, that we must seek for the causes of impoverishment.”^a

^a McCulloch, 1825 Ed., pages 407-408.

SECTION V

CAREY

THE earliest writer on economics in America who holds high rank is Henry C. Carey, of Philadelphia. His "Principles of Political Economy" appeared in 1837. He quotes approvingly Senior's criticism of Adam Smith's division of labor into productive and unproductive (Senior, pp. 51-3) and of products into services and commodities.¹⁰ In order to demonstrate that "the idea of exchange is inseparately connected with that of value," Carey says of a primitive family, "If, instead of finding a neighbor, A has been so fortunate as to obtain a wife, the same system of exchange would have been established. He would take the den, and she would cook the meat and convert the skins into clothing. He would raise the flax, and she would convert it into linen. If the family became numerous, one would cultivate the earth, and a second would supply the fish and other animal foods necessary for their support, while a third would be engaged in the management of the household, in the preparation of food, and in the manufacture of clothing. Here would be a system of exchange as complete as that of Cornhill, or Broadway. The only difference would be that value would not be indicated by *price*. In those larger communities, in which there is no separate property, the exchangeable value of the products of labor is as well settled as in London, or Paris."

This is exactly the position taken in this study of housework,—that it has exchange value, even if it is not measured in price.

¹⁰ Carey, pages 3-9.

SECTION VI

MILL

JOHNS STUART MILL, one of the best known of the economists, in his "Political Economy" (1848), notes the fact that women's wages are lower than men's, and adds, "Domestic servants' wages, speaking generally, are not determined by competition, but are greatly in excess of the market value of labour."¹¹ "Servants are paid wages higher than the market rate, for such reasons as ostentation, to get cheerful service, to have servants stay, etc. Liberality, generosity and the credit of the employer, are motives which . . . preclude taking the utmost advantage of competition." "There are kinds of labour of which the wages are fixed by custom, and not by competition," as that of women, servants, doctors, lawyers and others.¹²

In "Essays on Some Unsettled Questions of Political Economy," written in 1829-30, Mill says,¹³ that "there is labour which is partly productive and partly unproductive." "Such are the labour and the wages of domestic servants. Such persons are entertained mainly as subservient to mere enjoyment; but most of them occasionally and some habitually, render services which must be considered as of a productive nature; such as that of *cookery*, the last *stage* in the *manufacture* of *food*, [*italics mine*] or gardening, a branch of agriculture."

¹¹ Mill, page 490.

¹² Ibid., page 493.

¹³ Third Edition, 1877, page 85.

SECTION VII

PATTEN

THE first economist to give special attention to woman and her work in the home is Prof. S. N. Patten (for many years the honored head of the Department of Economics at the University of Pennsylvania), whose "Premises of Political Economy" appeared in 1885. In a chapter on "The Social Causes Producing a High Price of Food," we find the following suggestive paragraph: "There is another important circumstance affecting the consumption of food in the degree of exclusiveness of family life. Where each family lives in seclusion, having a private house, preparing its own food, and doing all other work without co-operation, the consumption of the food-supply is many times greater than it would be if the same families should so live as to allow the proper degree of division of labor. Certainly in the cooking and serving of food alone, at least half [?] of it is wasted or rendered worthless by the inefficiency of the labor employed in private life. It is a necessary disadvantage of private life that the labor be unskilled, as no person can wash, cook and perform all the other work of a family with as little waste and as efficiently as the labor could be performed under conditions where each person is engaged in one occupation only." "When the present mode of living becomes modified so as to allow a greater division of labor, there will be an important economy of the food-supply, and a much larger popula-

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

tion will be provided with subsistence without an increase of cost."¹⁴

In 1889, Prof. Patten's important book on "The Consumption of Wealth" appeared. Consumption, as well as production, of wealth now begins to receive the attention of the economist, because of the theory that the former determines the latter. This naturally leads the author to give considerable attention to the part which woman plays as the chief "consumer." (See p. 18, *supra*.) So, while no reference is made in the work under discussion to our theme, yet, in his later writings and in his lectures, Prof. Patten has become the chief exponent of the relation of economic laws to the home and household.

¹⁴ Patten, 1885 Edition, page 57.

SECTION VIII

ELY

AN INTRODUCTION to Political Economy" appearing in 1889, from the pen of Prof. Richard T. Ely, gives ample recognition to woman's economic contribution. Under a paragraph heading, "Productive Elements Often Overlooked," he observes, "It is necessary at this point to call attention to some important facts which are frequently overlooked. A large part of production, even now, is household production, as it may be called, and is not designed for the market-place, which indeed takes no note of it. Every well-regulated household is an establishment where valuable things or quantities of utility are produced. Food is prepared for use, and prepared food is worth far more than unprepared, as we discover when we purchase it at a boarding house, restaurant or hotel. Often the prepared food sells for more than twice the cost of the unprepared food. But other utilities are produced in the household. Clothing is prepared and repaired, comfortable shelter is afforded, and strength of body and mind of the chief productive factor, the human being, is nourished. It has been claimed that the labor of at least half of the women of a country is expended in producing material good things for the use of the producers."¹⁵ "Now, it is a fact that more than half of the human race in civilized nations is composed of women, and if it is admitted that women labor as long

¹⁵ See Edwin Cannan's *Elementary Pol. Ec.*, Part II, paragraph 8.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

and as severely as men, it follows that a fourth of the labor of men and women combined is destined for the household and not for the market. But this is only a part of the annual income of the country of which no account is taken in ordinary money-estimates of annual income. Three-fourths of the population of the United States is rural, and in the country a vast amount of material good things produced is destined for the household, and is rarely financially estimated." "Houses, furniture, books, . . . and the like, all annually produce quantities of utility. . . . Yet these utilities, when produced by goods owned by those who enjoy them, largely escape valuation."

"While household production is now large, it undoubtedly has relatively diminished in importance. Production of things which are bought and sold in the market-place, and are consequently readily estimated in money, is constantly gaining in importance on household production of material good things. . . . Should boarding-house and hotel life totally displace private housekeeping, it would increase the apparent annual production of wealth."¹⁶

¹⁶ Ely, 1889, pages 22-24.

SECTION IX

MARSHALL

PROF. ALFRED MARSHALL, of Cambridge, England, has given us in his "Principles of Economics" (1890), one of the fullest treatments of economics. Discussing Adam Smith's idea of unproductive labor, he says: "Many writers, even of recent times, have adhered to Adam Smith's plan of classing domestic servants as unproductive. There is, doubtless, in many large houses a superabundance of servants, some of whose energies might with advantage to the community be transferred to some other direction; but the same is true of the greater part of those who earn their livelihood by distilling whiskey; and yet no economist has proposed to call them unproductive. There is no distinction in character between the work of the baker, who provides bread for a family and that of a cook who boils potatoes. If the baker should be a confectioner, or fancy baker, it is probable that he spends at least as much of his time as the domestic cook does, on labour that is unproductive in the popular sense of providing transitory and unnecessary enjoyments."¹⁷ "Among the means of production are included the necessities of labour, but not ephemeral luxuries, and the maker of ices is thus classed as unproductive whether he is working for a pastry-cook, or as a private servant in a country house. But a brick-layer engaged in building a theatre is classed as produc-

¹⁷ Marshall, 1898 Edition, pages 134-5; 1907 Edition, Vol. I, pages 65-6.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

tive. No doubt the division between permanent and ephemeral sources of enjoyment is vague and unsubstantial. But this difficulty exists in the nature of things and cannot be completely evaded by any device of words."¹⁸

Under a consideration of "Social Income," Prof. Marshall observes that "The work of domestic servants is always classed as 'labour' in the technical sense; and since it can be assessed *en bloc* at the value of their wages without being enumerated in detail, its inclusion raises no statistical difficulty. There is, however, some inconsistency in omitting that heavy domestic work, which is done by women and other members of the household, where no servants are kept."¹⁹ As Prof. Marshall suggests, it may well be that the main reason why statisticians have included in national income the wages of servants and not that of housewives has been due to the difficulty of estimating the value of the latter.

¹⁸ Those who adopt the views expressed in the present work will avoid this difficulty.

¹⁹ Marshall, Sixth Edition, 1910, page 79.

SECTION X

SMART

INTERESTING observations on servants and services appear in "Studies in Economics," by William Smart (1895). "I am afraid," he says, "it is not always appreciated that, in the making of the servant, we really sink labour and capital in the making of a special kind of commodity." Then he compares a singer and an artisan. When the "sink of money" in feeding and training them is past, what is the difference between the two? "The artisan disgorges, as it were, all the wealth sunk in his apprenticeship; gives it back gradually to the world—not without interest—in the shape of goods from his hammer and chisel. The singer appears on a platform; exerts his vocal chords; we pay five shillings; and the world does not put itself down as any richer."

"Thus, year after year, wealth is sunk in making what we may call 'human commodities' . . . painters, players, musicians, teachers, clergymen, domestics. We recognize the value of these commodities; but all the same they do not appear in any balance sheet to our credit." . . . "Here, then, is perhaps the greatest difficulty in estimating the sum of wealth; that we are converting the raw material of the world, not only into commodities which we consume, but into commodities (teachers, domestics, doctors, clergymen, etc.) which consume!"²⁰

²⁰ Smart, pages 240-243.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

The fallacy of considering national wealth as a sum of things made, without including services, is here well indicated. The idea of considering persons as commodities or capital goods is generally rejected by contemporary writers on economics.²¹

Under a section heading, "Expenditure and Consumption," Prof. Smart says that, "To spend income is not to consume wealth"; only that money which is spent in the purchase of consumption goods is "pure consumption." "While a Vanderbilt may spend his income, it is beyond anything but an immense conflagration to consume it."²²

Some interesting remarks, based upon his personal expenditures, are given in a section on "The Categories of Consumption." "The categories under which most forms of private consumption may be grouped are: 1. Food and drink. 2. Dress, including ornament. 3. Shelter, including furnishings and equipment of house. 4. Transport, including travel and communication generally. 5. Education, including literature and art. 6. Recreation." Under the head of Food and Drink, Prof. Smart makes the point that "there is scarcely any form of consumption where excess" (over-eating or purchase of expensive foods, as champagne), "is so plainly robbery of a poor society." Dress is not entirely selfish consumption as is food, since it benefits others, first, in that expensive clothes when partly worn are passed on for the poor to use, and then "dress has an æsthetic mission as well as a utilitarian. The consumer of clothes has one side to the wearer, but another to the spectator. . . . It is obviously the opinion of one of the sexes

²¹ Seager, "Principles of Economics," page 149.

²² Smart, pages 269-272.

SMART

that a beautiful picture deserves a good frame. If feminine dress were not meant to show as much as to hide, there would be no sale for silk stockings." Shelter is still less selfish consumption, since "houses are built for the abode of successive generations," and they are also enjoyed by one's friends.²³

In a section entitled "The Service," the author returns to the subject discussed above. "The service is an economic 'good' just as the commodity is. . . . In paying for a dinner one pays for the food and one pays for the waiting on the same principle of value." "The gardener, laundress, tablemaid, sewing-maid have their counterparts in the park-keeper, public laundry girl, waiter and warehouse girl."

"Consumption of food—what we might call 'feeding'—is a joint consumption of material commodity and of services inhering in the cook and waiter who minister it. So it is with domestic servants generally; the consumption of 'shelter,' for instance, is a consumption not only of stone walls and furnishings, but of the staff who maintain the house; the services of coachmen, equally with those of railway servants, are inseparable, in the consideration of 'transport,' from their corresponding plant."

²³ Smart, pages 276-284.

SECTION XI

DEVINE

IN his "Economics" (1894), Dr. Edward T. Devine (Columbia), makes only one reference to the work of woman in the home, but that point is an exceedingly important one. He says: "The economic man, then, is a human being. The term is generic, including both men and women; not merely those who are usually called breadwinners, but also the *bread preparers*."²⁴ After thus emphasizing that the housewife is co-equal with man as a producer, Dr. Devine dismisses this whole field of economic activity. That this was, in all probability, not done through a lack of appreciation of the importance of woman's work, but rather because household production was not considered as being included in the general field of a text-book on economics, is evidenced by the fact that Dr. Devine has made the clearest and fullest statement on this subject which has yet appeared from the pen of any economist.²⁵

²⁴ Devine, 1894 Edition, page 2.

²⁵ Supra, page 18.

SECTION XII

SMART

FOUR years after the appearance of his "Studies in Economics," Prof. Smart published, "The Distribution of Income" (1899). Here we find the first reference to our topic in a marginal heading, "Woman's Work in the Household," and in an index, "Women in the House." A chapter sub-heading, "Income Which Escapes Both Notice and Assessment,"²⁶ reminds us of Prof. Ely's paragraph on "Productive Elements Often Overlooked."²⁷ "This," he says, "may be put in seven categories: (1) Unpaid services, particularly those of women, etc." Under the paragraph heading "Unpaid Services," we find: "It has been noticed that society has been divided into those who have two instruments of production and those who have only one. If the one is sufficient to yield the maintenance demanded, the other may be set free to work for love. Thus we have the services of members of Parliament, etc." "To these must be added the greatest unpaid service of all—that of women in the household. What this income really amounts to may be guessed if we imagine what we should have to pay to servants for doing work now done by wives, sisters and daughters, and how entirely impossible it would be to get similar work done for money. If such women went to the factory or into professional

²⁶ A title which raises the interesting query, "Should a housewife pay an income tax, levied on the valuation of her productive activities?"

²⁷ See page 197, *supra*.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

life, we should have to withdraw probably a much greater number from the factory or professions to take their place, and should lose something with it all. For the rest, it is easy enough to say with Prof. Marshall: 'A woman who makes her own clothes, or a man who digs his own garden or repairs his own house, is earning income just as would the dressmaker, gardener or carpenter, who might be hired to do the work.'" (Marshall, *Prin. of Ec.*, 4th Ed., p. 149).²⁸ Prof. Smart considers the services of a housewife as "unpaid" because they are paid in "kind" instead of in cash. Again, the author says: "Such work as that of the majority of women is not paid for at all in money, although it is necessary for what we call our 'life' as the work that is paid for."²⁹

²⁸ Smart, 1899 Edition, page 70.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, page 151.

SECTION XIII

VEBLEN

THE THEORY OF BUSINESS ENTERPRISE"
(1904), by Prof. Thorstein Veblen (Chicago), notes that, "The present is the age of business enterprise." But, "there are many items of great volume and consequence that do not fall within the immediate scope of these business principles. The housewife's work, e. g., as well as some appreciable portion of the work on farms and in some handicrafts, can scarcely be classed as business enterprise."³⁰

³⁰ Veblen, 1904 Edition, page 2.

SECTION XIV

SELIGMAN

AN excellent answer to Adam Smith's division of labor into productive and unproductive, is given in Prof. Edwin R. A. Seligman's "Principles of Economics" (1905). "The older economists maintained that the labor of servants, actors and the professional classes in general was unproductive, because not incorporated in visible objects." "To those who understand that human wants are satisfied by utilities, irrespective of the source whence they flow, it is clear that all labor which engenders such utilities is productive. Labor is unproductive only when its efforts are wasted. The trader, the lawyer, the doctor, the artist, are no less productive than the workman, the farmer or the manufacturer, provided they accomplish something that society wants. The test is the creation of new utilities or values."⁸¹ Here is where the mention of the activities of the housewife might reasonably be expected and its omission indicates the need of continual emphasis upon the economic value of household work until the productive labors of one-half of the world's workers may receive due consideration.

⁸¹ Seligman, 1909 Edition, pages 277-8.

SECTION XV

FISHER

IN very brief form we find two references to our topic in Prof. Irving A. Fisher's "Elementary Principles of Economics" (1911). In the chapter on "Income," he says: "The income from any particular article of wealth has been defined as the flow of benefits from that article, . . . whether these benefits happen to be in the form of money payments or not." "A wife does housework; her work is an item of the family's income. The warmth and shelter that a house provides for its occupants constitute the income furnished by the house."

SECTION XVI

PATTEN

HAVING covered the principal publications of the prominent economists,²² a brief account of certain articles by Prof. Patten cannot be overlooked.

In an article in the "Independent" (Dec. 1, 1904) entitled, "Young Wives in Industry," Prof. Patten argues that one way of solving the present problem of celibacy, due to the inability of two people to live decently on the wages of one unskilled worker (\$10 a week), is for the woman to continue in industry until her husband's income reaches \$20 a week. He says: "The master key to family unity is not found in the division of function into supporting husband and supported wife; or its unity in the near future as likely to be endangered by preserving, until the struggling family is on its feet, the independent industrial status of the pair before marriage, as it is by the sudden removal of one person into a position of semi-unoccupied dependence upon another's grinding wages." "The city home of the immediate future will be unique in that it will be built by two who are educated, side by side, in the public school, whose industrial careers are side by side in the factory, whose plans of life, formed by the same city outlook, have resulted in like powers and parallel interests."

"The point at which withdrawal from outside industry to the extension of activity within the home is good

²² Appendix D.

PATTEN

economy is not reached until the husband's wage makes possible options, saving, investment and the rewards of capital wherein the future has to be balanced with the present and its returns. When the house can be conducted on a scale which will utilize the faculties of one mind, with room for growth besides, then the natural homemaker is more valuable there than in industry. At the present cost of living the husband must earn at least \$20 a week before that point is reached."

Prof. Patten again appears in the "Independent" in September, 1906, with an article on "Some New Adjustments for Women," a further discussion of married women working at "gainful occupations." Woman, he says, cherishes the conviction that her spiritual values to her husband and children lie in service-altruism, that is, in direct personal work with her own hands for them and the greater the amount of work the larger the spiritual service. Her tasks as homemaker are considered essential means for the exercise of her influence for good over husband and child. But, he concludes, income-altruism will exceed service-altruism only if income values exceed sacrifice utility; that is, if the sacrifice which the woman makes in doing household work does not bring direct benefits to the family larger than would accrue if she worked outside of the home and then applied the income received to the raising of the family standard of living, then she should go out to work.

Finally, "the daughter of a man who earns \$10 a week may help him with the commodity he needs most—money; she is, in fact, expected to help him, and is thought a trifler if she shirks; but the bride of a man who earns \$10 must cease to forward him in the same way."²²

²² See page 120, *supra*.

SECTION XVII

CONCLUSION

FROM the foregoing study of the economists and household work, we have ascertained that many of them recognize these activities as productive, yet none give to them the same consideration that they do to the productive labor of men, or that of women in factories or business offices.³⁴ What we are interested in is the sum total of Household and of National Income. In each of these we must certainly include the work of both men and women workers, no matter where their work is done.

And even though the labors of the housewives of our land do not produce economic values equivalent with those of the so-called industrial workers, female or male, yet it is a pregnant query whether the sum total of happiness of the American family is not as much dependent upon the amount and value of the work of housewives as of husbands.

³⁴ Appendix D.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

HOUSEHOLD SCHEDULE

1. Residence of family, address?
2. Birthplace of housekeeper?
- Birthplace of husband?
- Brought up in city, town, village, suburbs or country?
- Ditto, husband?
3. Composition of household?

MEMBERS	Ap- prox- imate Age	Sex	Occupation	Health ¶	Household Work § Hours Daily	
					Week Days	Sun- days
Housekeeper						
Husband						
*						
Oldest child						
†						
Boarders, lodgers						
Servants						
Hired Help**						

* Other relatives in order of relationship. † Other children in order of age. || All working regularly each day whether residing with family or sleeping out. ¶ Measured by physical ability to do household work (except children under fourteen), eight hours a day, "good," "fair" or "poor"; average for past year. § Including care of children. ** Working regularly by day or hour, but not as servant by the week.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

4. Are you living in an apartment, a house or a hotel? How long have you lived in present dwelling?

Form [house, apartments or hotel] of previous residence?

Number of rooms therein?

Do you prefer your present location to that in which you were reared? If so, why; if not, why not?

If you had a choice would you prefer to change to another form of habitation? If so, why?

Mention what you consider the advantages of your present residence over other forms?

Its disadvantages?

5. Is dwelling rented or owned?

If rented, does rental include hot water?

Heat? Janitor service? Care of rooms?

6. How is dwelling heated?

Who takes care of heating?

7. Give number of rooms and halls in your house or apartment.

8. How many steps from stove to sink?

From stove to work table in kitchen? From stove to dining room table?

9. Is there any place especially provided for children to play in your house or apartment?

On roof? In yard [state approximate size]?

Do your children play in the street? If so, alone or always in the care of someone?

10. How are floors of rooms and halls covered?

Summer? Winter?

How many have carpets?

How many have matting?

APPENDIX A

How many have rugs?

If carpets and matting are used state how frequently they are taken up and cleaned, how cleaned and by whom?

Same of rugs (do not include here regular daily or weekly cleaning).

How many rugs?

Are carpets and rugs ever cleaned by machinery outside of home?

Do you own a vacuum cleaner?

If you do not own a vacuum cleaner do you rent one?

How often?

Who uses it?

11. Do you cook with wood, coal, gas, oil, alcohol or electricity?

If you use coal or wood who carries fuel from cellar to kitchen stove?

For lighting do you use candles, oil, gas or electricity?

If you had a choice would you change your present heating or lighting methods, and why?

12. Do you or any of your regular household do any papering, painting, whitewashing, make carpentry repairs or any other work in house not usually classed as household work?

If so, how much time spent in each such line of work in past year?

13. Is any work done in the home other than household work and that included in answer to query 12?

If so, give details including nature of such work, amount of time spent at it in average week, how much room is required in performing such work, etc.

14. How many labor-saving devices do you now make regular use of in your housework? Place "yes"

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

or "no" after each article mentioned below and add others.

In each case state the reason why you do not use the article mentioned: because you think it will not work; because of expense in purchasing article; because you do not wish to be bothered with experimenting with something new; because of ignorance or prejudice of your assistants; or any other reason?

Vacuum cleaner (hand, electric)?

Carpet sweeper?

Sewing machine?

Washing machine (hand or power)?

Electric or gas iron?

Power attachment (electric, water) for sewing machine, washing machine, wringer, mangle?

Fireless cooker?

Dish washer?

Bread mixer?

APPENDIX A

15. In the following table state the number of hours' work done by each member of the household in each line of household work during an average week; skill of each one in each line of work (1, excellent; 2, good; 3, fair; 4, poor; 5, very poor); designate how much each one likes to do each line of work (1, keen enjoyment; 2, pleasure; 3, indifference; 4, dislike; 5, strong dislike).

Members of household doing household work	HOURS OF WORK			SKILL			PLEASURE		
	House-wife	House-worker	Other helpers	House-wife	House-worker	Other helpers	House-wife	House-worker	Other helpers
Food									
Purchasing.									
Cooking (including preparing).									
Serving (including clearing away).									
Washing dishes, pots, pans, etc.									
CLOTHING									
Purchasing.†									
Making.†									
Repairing.†									
Washing.									
Ironing.									
Care of (cleaning, pressing, sorting, putting away).									
HOUSE									
Cleaning (daily routine).									
Cleaning (weekly routine).									
Care of, other than cleaning. (Chamberwork, setting to rights, etc.).									
CHILDREN									
Care of person, (dressing, bathing, etc.).									
Oversight of.*									
Teaching and entertaining.									
MANAGEMENT (Accounts, planning, work, etc.)									

*Oversight of children while also doing other things, as eating meals, shopping when out walking with them, etc., should count in this column just what additional time is required above that necessary if there were no children. †Do not include servants. ||Is servants' wash included?

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

16. If physical ability and skill of housekeeper and present assistants were first class, could all your household work be done, as you would like to see it done, during present working hours?

Could it be done if housekeeper and present assistants worked on an eight-hour day basis?

17. Would you prefer to have assistants come in by the day or hour [sleep out], or have them live in your house [or apartment]?

Why?

(State in brackets, after each name below, what wages you would be willing to pay for service if you could get assistants whose health and skill were rated first class.)

18. What wages do you pay for cook?	()
Waitress?	()
Chambermaid?	()
Seamstress?	()
Laundress?	()
Child's Nurse?	()
General houseworker?	()

19. Give an average day's menu and mention principal variations from this on other days of the week).

20. Do you make bread? (In each case state whether all, or what proportion of that used.)
Cake? Rolls? Pie? Butter? Do
you put up fruits and vegetables? If so, specify
amount annually of jams, jellies, preserves, canned fruits
and vegetables, grape-juice, etc.

21. When food is served is it placed upon the table and passed around by those at the table or is it passed by a waitress?

Which method do you prefer, and why?

APPENDIX A

22. About how much time is lost each week by those preparing and serving meals through the irregularity of any members of the household in being late at meals?

23. Do all the present members of the household take all their meals at home as a rule; if not, state which ones regularly get meals outside, and how many meals weekly?

24. How much company do you entertain at meals on the average each week?

Is extra assistance usually secured on such occasions?

If so, how much?

26. What is average weekly *cost* of washing and ironing, clothing done at laundry?

By outside laundress?

By laundress coming in by

the day?

27. *Annual Budget*—Give your estimate of amount spent annually by total household group under each of the following headings. (State after each figure whether it is taken from actual accounts kept, from bills, or is a guess.)

Food?

Clothing? (Exclude servants)

Rental (or equivalent)?

Heat and light?

Furniture and furnishings?

Wages?

28. Does the housekeeper receive a stipulated sum weekly, monthly or yearly for household expenses or is money paid her as needed?

Ditto for housekeeper's personal expenses?

Who usually pays the monthly bills?

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

25. In the subjoined table state how many of each article are bought or made annually (where an article, as a coat, is bought every second or third year, count it one-half or one-third, etc.). "Special workers" mean those who are hired to come into the house for a day or two for the special purpose of making, repairing or laundering clothing. "Regular workers" are the members of the household including assistants paid by the week or month. Do not include servants, boarders or lodgers (unless relatives or sufficiently intimate to be considered as part of family). State how many of the persons listed under query 3 are included in answers to this query.

	NEW CLOTHING [annual].			
	Bought Ready Made	Made to Order Outside Home	Made at Home Special Workers	Made at Home Regular Workers
	No.	No.	No.	No.
Hats, caps (men)				
Hats, Bonnets (women)				
Overcoats, cloaks				
Suits (men)				
Suits (women)				
Dresses				
Shirts (men)				
Shirtwaists				
Petticoats				
Skirts				
Vests (men)				
Collars and cuffs (pairs)				
Ties				
Handkerchiefs				
Night robes				
Underwear (separate)				
Underwear (union suits)				
Socks, stockings (pairs)				
Shoes				
Gloves, mittens				
Sweaters				
Other garments				
Table linen				
Bed linen				
Towels				

APPENDIX A

29. If you had a choice would you prefer taking all (or some) of your meals at home or in a general dining-room, and why?

Is your answer principally affected by financial considerations?

What is your husband's choice?

30. Would the requirement to be at the table within a specified hour be a serious factor in your estimate of the advantages and disadvantages of using a general dining-room?

31. If food could be served in your own dining-room from a central kitchen as cheaply as you can prepare it yourself would you prefer such an arrangement to your present method?

32. Do you feel that the possibility of having food served in such manner as best pleases your individual taste by home cooking more than compensates for any possible advantage in obtaining more skillful cooking or a possible saving in expense through any other method of serving meals?

How does your husband feel about this?

33. Do you consider that the making of cooking, sewing, washing, house-cleaning, etc., distinct professions handled by separate workers [as other lines of work formerly done in the home are now specialized] would diminish the value and happiness of home life?

34. If you had a choice would you prefer household work to any other profession, and why?

If not, what lines of work would you prefer? [Name two in order of preference.]

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

Have you done or are you doing any work for which you received or are receiving a salary; or have you received definite offers to work for a specified salary? State nature of work and salary?

35. If you were to join a group of families living on a plan of co-operative housekeeping or some similar arrangement, which line of household work would you choose to specialize in? [See list under Query 15]

36. Do you feel that you get a satisfaction out of household work because you are doing it for your family which you would not feel if you were doing the same work professionally for a salary?

What do you consider the value in dollars, per month, of your present work as housekeeper?

37. Have you ever taken any courses of training in housework in any school, or private paid lessons? If so, when, where and how long?

38. Do you subscribe for and read regularly any household magazines? (Put "subscribe" opposite those taken and regularly read; write "read" opposite those not subscribed for but read regularly.)

The Journal of Home Economics. Monthly. \$2.00.

(Published by American Home Economics Association. Roland Park Branch, Baltimore, Md.)

Good Housekeeping Magazine. \$1.25. 381 Fourth Avenue, New York.

American Motherhood. \$1.00.

Give names of books on household topics which you have read?

APPENDIX A

39. Are you a member of any club or association which devotes at least part of its time to household affairs? If so, what organization?

40. Give names of other housekeepers who you think would be interested in filling out a schedule.

(Your name will not be mentioned)

41. *Weekly Schedule*—Give the daily routine for each day of an average week showing the amount of time which each member of the household spends in household work (including care of children). A sample daily schedule is presented here to show the form desired:

HOUSEKEEPER'S SCHEDULE

Wednesday, January 15, 1915

A. M.	A. M.	P. M.	P. M.
7.00 Personal	7.30	1.20 Washing dishes	2.00
7.30 Cooking	7.45	2.00 Cleaning up kitchen	2.20
7.45 Serving	8.00	2.20 Repairing clothing	3.00
8.00 Personal	8.30	3.00 Personal	3.45
8.30 Care of children	8.45	3.45 Entertaining children	4.30
8.45 Clearing table	9.00	4.30 Purchase of clothing	5.00
9.00 Washing dishes	9.30	5.00 Care of children	5.25
9.30 Clearing up kitchen	9.45	5.25 Cooking	6.00
9.45 Care of house	10.15	6.00 Serving	6.20
10.15 Weekly cleaning	11.15	6.20 Personal	6.55
11.15 Purchasing food	11.45	6.55 Clearing table	7.15
11.45 Preparing and	P. M.	7.15 Washing dishes	7.50
P. M. cooking food	12.30	7.50 Teaching children	8.40
12.30 Personal	1.00	8.40 Accounts	9.20
1.00 Clearing table	1.20	9.20 Personal	10.30

Use word "personal" for all time spent otherwise than in doing household work (eating, dressing, taking a nap, talking, visiting, reading, etc.). In general, make use of terms used in sample schedule and in table under Query

15. When doing two kinds of work in frequent alternation, as dressing the children while cooking breakfast, divide time as though you had continuously done first

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

one thing and then the other to save making many entries covering a few minutes each.

Use a separate sheet of paper for each person doing household work during week scheduled; state which member of household group is being listed, and state day of week.

Return schedule, filled out, to John B. Leeds, Temple University, Philadelphia.

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO ACCOMPANY SCHEDULE

DEAR MADAM :

With this letter a schedule is enclosed which you are requested to fill out and return as soon as practicable. If your experience is like that of others, you will find that this work will be of value to yourself as well as an aid to scientific inquiry.

It is said that whereas a man's work is from sun to sun, a woman's work is never done, yet no attempt has been made heretofore to gather data in any scientific manner as to just how much work really is done in the household, nor have the economists attempted to determine the value of such work.

Does the average housewife really earn her own living, or is she "dependent" upon her husband for "support"? Are her long hours of labor due to lack of skill, of physical efficiency, of systematic organization of work, or is it humanly impossible for one woman to do satisfactorily all the work of a family without assistance, and still retain good health and leisure for social, intellectual and esthetic life? Is the latter possible for all or even most of the earnest, educated housewives of today? If not, why not? Is it the fault of the individual or of our domestic system?

You can contribute something toward shedding light upon these and many other important problems by a careful study of the schedule enclosed. All information will, of course, be considered confidential.

If you are not in a position as head of a household to give the information desired, please pass on the schedule to some friend whom you think likely to be interested. I will be glad to have the names of any persons who would be interested in filling out a schedule.

Very truly yours,

Temple University,
Philadelphia, Pa.

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

COLLEGE HALL

19 Main Avenue, Ocean Grove, N. J.

A UNIQUE PLAN will be carried out this summer at *College Hall*, Ocean Grove, to run the hotel entirely by Temple University students on the basis of "summer camp" good-fellowship.

College Hall is one block from the boardwalk on Main Avenue, one of the finest avenues in Ocean Grove. A good view of the sea is obtained from the front porch and a still finer view from the cupola. Bathing grounds and swimming pool are near by; also hot and cold seawater baths.

In the Auditorium, seating 10,000 persons, there are inspiring services on the Sabbath; during the week, concerts and select motion pictures with music of the wonderful organ. Each morning at the Temple the Young People's Meeting gives an hour of inspiration.

Just across Wesley Lake is Asbury Park, where all the usual seashore attractions are offered.

Lakes on both sides of Ocean Grove afford boating and canoeing, while a twenty-minute trolley trip brings one to beautiful Deal Lake with its canoes and motor boats, and pine woods famous for picnic suppers. Half an hour's ride southward is Shark River and inexhaustible fun in crabbing; sailing may also be enjoyed, in water shallow enough to suit the most timid.

Add to this that nowhere in all the world is there a finer drive than that to Long Branch, through miles of

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

beautiful summer cottages, including Elberon, where our honored President will spend the summer at "Shadow Lawn." Miss Margaret Wilson has agreed to give a concert in the Auditorium during the summer.

Yacht sails daily from fishing pier; fishing 8 A. M., sailing at 2 P. M.

Public tennis courts and bowling alleys.

No saloons.

No mosquitoes or malaria.

At *College Hall* graduates in Household Science will demonstrate how a plain home table can be served with such tastiness as to lure one to linger longer. In place of the customary service, everything will be attended to by the deft hands of well-trained young women.

A graduate in Household Art will be in charge of the sewing room, attend to repairs, etc.

Mothers with children may have a real rest by arranging with a Kindergartner to take the young folks at a moderate rate per hour. Older children (15 to 50!) will be taken on hikes, given lessons in swimming, athletic exercises, folk games, basketry work, etc., by a competent graduate in Physical Training.

A woman physician will be at the Hall over week-ends for consultation.

Smoking not permitted on the premises—the boardwalk is near.

Ample porches on first and second floors. Electric lights in each room. Plenty of light and air. All hair mattresses.

The purposes of this plan are:

- 1 To give Temple University graduates a thorough practical training in their respective fields.

APPENDIX C

2 To assist undergraduates in working their way through college.

3 To give a higher grade of service. College training should stand for this to prove its value.

Students, under competent management, will have charge of *College Hall*, June 15 to September 15, 1916.¹

¹Not open for season of 1917 on account of the war.

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX D

ECONOMISTS AND HOUSEHOLD PRODUCTIVE ACTIVITIES

A CURSORY examination of the following works of well-known economists revealed no references of importance to the household activities of women:

Malthus, Thomas R., "Essay on the Principle of Population." 1798.

Malthus, Thomas R., "Principles of Political Economy." 1820.

Ricardo, David, "Principles of Political Economy and Taxation." 1817.

Senior, Nassau William, "Political Economy," 1836.

Bastiat, Frederic, "Harmonies Économiques." 1850.

Marx, Karl, "Das Capital." Vol. 1, 1867. Vol. 2, 1885. Vol. 3, 1895.

Rogers, J. E. Thorold, "Manual of Political Economy." 1868.

Jevons, W. Stanley, "Theory of Political Economy." 1871.

Cairnes, J. E., "Political Economy." 1874.

George, Henry, "Progress and Poverty." 1879.

Sidgwick, Henry, "Principles of Political Economy." 1883.

Walker, Francis A., "Political Economy." 1883.

Clark, John Bates, "The Philosophy of Wealth." 1887.

Böhm-Bawerk, Eugen von, "Positive Theory of Capital." 1889.

THE HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

Wieser, F. von, "Natural Value." 1889.

Pantaleoni, Maffeo, "Pure Economics." 1889.

Smart, William, "An Introduction to the Theory of Value." 1891.

Ely, Richard T., "Outlines of Economics." 1893. (In the 1916 edition three budgetary studies are referred to and tables given from Engel, Chapin and the U. S. Bureau of Labor. On page 151 the author says: "The work of the housewife and the services of friendship embody utilities, that is, satisfy human wants, just as do money-making activities, but they are not reported in terms of dollars and cents.")

Nicholson, J. Shield, "Principles of Political Economy." Vol. 1, 1893. Vol. 2, 1897. Vol. 3, 1901. (Vol. 3, page 334,—“the employer is the consumer of his liveried servants.”)

Hadley, Arthur Twining, "Economics." 1896.

Bullock, C. J., "Introduction to the Study of Economics." 1897.

Clark, John Bates, "The Distribution of Wealth." 1899.

Fetter, Frank A., "Principles of Economics." 1904.

Carver, Thomas N., "Distribution of Wealth." 1904.

Seager, Henry R., "Introduction to Economics." 1904. (A page is devoted to a discussion of the "Nutritive Value of Different Foods." On page 72 the term "domestic economics" occurs in a statement regarding making consumption economical.)

Clark, John Bates, "Essentials of Economic Theory." 1907.

APPENDIX D

Taussig, F. W., "Principles of Economics." 1911. (Vol. 1, page 113, "Even in the modern family, there is division of labor, after a sort, between man and wife. But commonly we consider the family as a unit, and think of the housewife, when she works for husband and family, as working for that of which she is but a part.")

Seager, Henry R., "Principles of Economics." (A new edition of the "Introduction," with considerable new material added. The attitude toward certain problems is also somewhat modified.)

Works appearing since 1913 have not been examined nor were all the editions of the various books mentioned above included.

INDEX

- Accounts, household .. 69-70
- Advancement, 137, 138, 149, 151-2, 156-9, 165, 168-9
- Alberti 182-7
- Amer. Home Economics Assoc. 94
- Amount of household work 29-94
- Baking 40
- Bargains 23, 50
- Bastiat 239
- Beneficence 149, 152-3, 166
- Beverages 139, 141
- Birth rate 119-120
- Board and lodging, included in wages 111-2
- Böhm-Bawerk, E. 239
- Books 152, 165
- Bread 139-140
- Bread-mixer 82
- Bruère, M. B. and R. W. 18, 135
- Budget, analyzed, 13, 135-154, 155-171
- Budget, percentages of expenditures 169
- Budgets, 13, 36, 99-100, 135-72
- Bullock, C. J. 240
- Butter 41, 139-140
- Buying food, etc. (see Food, purchase)
- Cairnes, J. E. 239
- Candy 152, 169
- Capital 160
- Carey, H. C. 193
- Carfare (see Transportation)
- Carver, T. N. 240
- Cereals 139-140
- Chapin, R. C. 135
- Charity 152-3
- Charm 100, 162
- Children 35- 6
- Children, care of, 62-3, 85, 121-2, 156-9
- Children, oversight of, 64, 85, 166
- Choice, production not consumption 25-6
- Clark, J. B. 24, 239, 240
- Cleaning materials ... 149, 151
- Cleanliness 57-60
- Clothing, care of 56, 89
- Clothing, expenditures, 137-8, 142-148, 156-9, 164, 168
- Clothing, laundry, 49, 54-5, 80-2, 85
- Clothing, making .. 51-2, 85, 89
- Clothing, purchase, 23, 50, 85, 89, 186-7
- Clothing, repairing 53, 85
- Coats 145-6
- Collars 142, 144, 147
- College Hall, 10, 125-32, Appendix C
- Consumer, woman as (see Spender) 20, 196
- Consumption 202-3
- Consumption, wasteful vs. economical 195
- Conwell, Russell H. 128
- Cooking (see Food)
- Co-operative housekeeping (see Household work a gainful occupation; and, Specialization in household work)
- Correspondence 152, 166
- Dependent, woman as, 100-101, 118-120, 176, 184-5
- Devine, E. T., 18, 19, 25-6, 115, 189, 204
- Divorce 13, 102
- Domestics (see Houseworkers) 104

- Domestic Science 12, 93
 Dresses 145, 146
 Economists on household work,
 173-212, Appendix D
 Education 149, 152, 165
 Education in household
 science 93
 Eggs 139, 140
 Eight-hour day 77-8, 130
 Ely, R. T. 197-8, 205, 240
 Equipment (see Labor-
 saving machines)
 Exchange value of
 household work,
 99, 102, 193, 197
 Extra work time (see
 Overtime)
 Family 183
 Family, normal 115, 136
 Fashion 179-180, 202-3
 Fetter, F. 25, 240
 Fireless cooker 83
 Fisher, I. A. 209
 Food, cooking.. 39-42, 85, 88-9
 Food, dish washing.... 48, 85
 Food expenditures,
 137-141, 156-9, 163, 166-7
 Food inspector 38
 Food, menus 40
 Food, purchase,
 21-3, 37-8, 85-7, 186
 Food serving 43-7, 85
 Frederick, Mrs. Chris-
 tine 44, 92
 Fruits 139, 141
 Furniture and furnish-
 ings 149, 151
 Gardening as house-
 work 75, 167
 George, Henry 239
 Giddings, F. H. 116
 Gifts 166, 171
 Gilman, Charlotte Per-
 kins (Stetson),
 18, 27, 94, 103, 117, 175
 Gloves 142, 144, 145, 147
 Goods 11
 Goldmark, Josephine .. 107
 Hadley, Arthur T. 240
 Handkerchiefs,
 142, 144, 145, 147
 Hats 142, 143, 145, 147
 Health 149, 152, 165
 Health, as affecting
 household work 73-4
 Heat,
 149, 150, 159, 163, 165, 167
 Heating, care of 61
 Higher life 151
 Homework other than
 housework 75-6
 Hosiery 142, 143, 145, 147
 Hour, work by 105-6
 Hours, working 67-71
 House, care of 61, 85, 90
 House, cleaning .. 57-60, 85, 90
 House, rooms in 58
 Household economics,
 definition of 11, 176
 Household economics,
 education in.... 12, 93, 127-8
 Household management,
 65, 85, 90, 156-9, 184-5
 Household work a gain-
 ful occupation.. 90-2, 113-123
 Household work as pro-
 duction, 17-27, 188-
 192, 195, 197-8, 199-
 200, 206, 209
 Household work, value
 of 17, 95-114, 156-7
 Houseworker (see Serv-
 ants)
 Houseworker, value of
 work 155-7
 Housewife as producer 15-28
 Housewife, value of
 work 110-2, 155-7
 Ice 139, 141
 Income .. 153, 170-1, 209, 211-2
 Income, national 198, 211
 Insurance,
 153, 159, 163, 164, 168
 Interest 163, 164, 168
 Jevons, W. S. 21, 239
 Journal of Home Eco-
 nomics 94, 224
 Kingsley, Chas. 57
 Labor-saving machines. 79-83
 Laundry (see Clothing),
 142, 144, 147
 Light 149, 150, 163, 165

- Liquors152, 169
 Loss (deficit)... 154, 159, 162
 McCulloch, J. R. 190-2
 Maine, wages in 104-7
 Malthus, T. R. 239
 Management
 (see Household)
 Marketing21-22, 37-8
 Marshall, Alfred,
 21, 135, 199-200
 Marx, Karl 239
 Mason, Otis T. 94
 Meals, purchased, 139, 141, 166
 Meats139-140
 Menial work... 128, 130-1, 188
 Milk139, 140
 Mill, J. S.118, 194
 Monopoly, law of, ap-
 plied to housework.. 99-102
 Monopoly, law of, ap-
 plied to marriage 102
 More, Louise B. 135
 Nearing, Scott 19
 Neckties 142, 144, 147
 Nicholson, J. S. 240
 Nightshirts, 142, 143, 145, 146
 Nursing 74
 Operation, expenditures,
 137, 138, 149-150
 Overcoats 142-3, 145-6
 Overshoes 142-3, 145, 147
 Overtime 72
 Pandolfini 182-3
 Pantaleoni, M. 240
 Paper, daily152, 165
 Parloa, Maria 12
 Patten, S. N.,
 35, 115, 162, 195-6, 210-1
 Pleasure in housework. 84-92
 Preserving 41
 Producer, woman as .. 15-28
 Production 11
 Production, household
 work as (see House-
 hold work)
 Production, services as.188-192
 Profits 159, 161-2
 Purchaser, woman as
 (see Spender)
 Ravenhill and Schiff... 175
 Raw materials159-160
 Recreation149, 152, 165
 Rent (see Shelter)
 Replacement fund..159, 160-161
 Ricardo, David 239
 Richards, Ellen H., 18, 94, 138
 Rogers, J. E. Thorold.. 239
 Salmon, Lucy 94, 104, 108
 153, 156, 157, 159
 Savings, 137, 138, 149,
 153, 156, 157, 159
 Schedule, household,
 33-4, Appendix A
 Seager, Henry R., 11, 17, 26,
 40, 103, 107, 123, 158, 162, 240-1
 Seligman, E. R. A. 208
 Senior, N. W. 98, 193, 239
 Servants (see House-
 worker), 104, 185, 188, 190-2
 Servants, wages of 104-9
 Servants, work of,
 188-192, 199-200
 Services as wealth,
 17, 31-2, 201-2, 203
 Services as production,
 31, 194, 199-200, 205-6
 Services, unpaid . 32, 198, 205
 Serving (see Food)
 Sewing (see Clothing,
 repairing)
 Shelter (see House),
 expenditures, 137, 138, 149,
 150, 156, 157, 159, 164, 168, 171
 Sherman, H. C. 87
 Shirts142-143
 Shoes..... 142, 143, 145, 147
 Shopping23-24, 50
 Sidgwick, Henry 239
 Skill in household work 84-92
 Skirts145, 146
 Smart, William,
 21, 32, 201-3, 205-6, 240
 Smith, Adam,
 108, 188-9, 190, 208
 Social durable con-
 sumption goods 170-1
 Socrates 176-7
 Specialization in house-
 hold work 116-7
 Spender, woman as
 (see Consumer), 12, 20-1, 202
 Spending money, 152, 166, 169
 Steps, saving 44
 Stetson (see Gilman)

Streightoff, F. H.	99, 135	Vegetables	139-140
Student service, 125-132, Appendix C		Vegetarian	40, 70
Suits	142-3, 145-6		
Sweets	139, 141	Wages	107-8, 149, 151
Taussig, F. W.	241	Wages, housewife's, 97-103, 159, 161	
Taxes	159, 161	Wages, houseworker's (servants'), 104-9, 159, 161, 194	
Telephone, 149, 151, 164, 166, 167, 168		Wages of management, 159, 161	
Temple University ...	128, 136	Waists	145-6
Thompson, Maud	97	Waitress (see Food, serving)	
Thompson, Robert Ellis	117	Walker, F. A.	239
Thrift	183-184	Wieser, F. von	240
Time lost	73-4	Wife supported by hus- band (see Dependent)	
Transportation	150, 152	Woman as producer (see Household work as production)	
Travel	152, 166, 168	Women in industry....	209-211
Umbrellas ..	142, 144, 145, 147	Xenophon....	18, 176, 181, 183
Underwear	142-3, 145-6		
Vacuum cleaner	80		
Value of household work	95-112		
Veblen, T.	25, 122, 207		

APP I 1919

